

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The Robert M. and Laura Lee Lintz
Book Endowment for the Humanities

Class of 1924

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 091 301 121



The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924091301121>

THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT
Vol. 2

THE
REVISERS' GREEK TEXT

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN READINGS, TEXTUAL
AND MARGINAL, IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT ADOPTED BY THE LATE
ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISERS

Volume II

By REV. S. W. WHITNEY, A.M.

Πάντα δοκιμάετε, τὸ καλὸν κατεχετε
PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD



BOSTON
SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
1892

PROLEGOMENON.

IN view of the examination thus far made of the Revisers' Greek Text, the question may arise, how it is possible that a body of scholars so eminent as the Company of New-Testament Revisers should have been betrayed into introducing so many apparently, and often obviously, false readings. The answer is a very simple one. It was owing in part to the manner in which they performed their self-imposed task, and in part to the principles by which they were governed.

In the first place, as a body they were not textual critics; that is, they were not men who had devoted years to the study of the Greek Text of the New Testament with special reference to its correctness or incorrectness as a transcript of the long-lost autographs. The task of presenting to the Company the arguments *pro* and *con* in regard to any questionable reading became therefore a necessity. This was generally devolved upon Drs. Scrivener and Hort, the two members of the body who stood almost alone as entitled to speak with authority on questions relating to the text. After a statement of the facts, and a presentation by each of his views, and his judgment in reference to the reading or readings, there was generally more or less questioning and discussion among the members of the body present at the time; after which the vote of the Company was taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected. This was the manner in which, as one of their own number expresses it, "the text was settled."¹ Generally speaking, it

¹ See *Lectures on Bible Revision*, pp. 119, 120, by Samuel Newth, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.

NT 24.211
W 616
V.2

COPYRIGHT, 1892,

By SILVER, BURDETT & CO.

PRINTED BY

TYPOGRAPHY BY J. S. CUSHING & CO., BOSTON.

PRESSWORK BY BERWICK & SMITH, BOSTON.

was Dr. Hort's earnestness and eloquence that won the day. This is probably what Dr. Schaff means in speaking of Dr. Hort as one who "exerted great influence in the Revision Company on all matters of reading."¹ And as the readings advocated by him were those adopted by himself and Dr. Westcott in the "advance sheets" of their forth-coming Greek Testament, which had been previously and freely distributed among the Revisers for their examination and information, and which were regarded as presumably presenting the purest and best Greek text of the New Testament in existence, they were almost as a matter of course adopted. The exceptions to this were comparatively few, and mostly on points practically of minor importance. A Text adopted in this hasty manner, without previous personal investigation or a thorough examination of the evidence in support of or against the varying readings, must almost of necessity introduce errors of various kinds.

Is it any wonder, then, that corrupt readings should abound in a Text framed by a body of men who, however eminent they might be in other departments of knowledge and Christian work, after listening to plausible arguments in behalf of those readings, should "settle the text" by voting them in?

That it should scarcely be otherwise will be still more obvious when we look at the principle which may be said to constitute the corner-stone on which this new structure, the Revisers' Text, was erected, namely, that the readings of the oldest extant Greek manuscripts are to be preferred to those of all other documents. This is the leading principle with Drs. Westcott and Hort in all their labors upon the Greek text of the New Testament; and their views on this point were very largely shared by the majority of the New-Testament Company, and governed them in their decisions. Such is the estimate placed by those learned editors on the readings of

¹ Introduction to Amer. edition of *Westcott and Hort's New Testament in Greek*, p. ix.

the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices that other readings, however strongly attested, are practically of no account. Cursives that differ from these manuscripts are disregarded altogether. Early versions and Fathers that support other readings are similarly set aside and frowned upon. Such documents and readings are everywhere branded as Syrian, or Western, or Alexandrian, — terms of no meaning of course, except at most to indicate the class of manuscripts to which they are adjudged as belonging, and always to show that readings so designated are not found in B, and that, in the judgment of these critics, they are false and unworthy of regard. In their eyes, "B very far exceeds all other documents in neutrality [*i.e.* in purity] of text."¹ "It holds a unique position. Its text is throughout Pre-Syrian"; *i.e.* ante-Nicene or apostolic.² "Even when B stands quite alone, its readings must never be lightly rejected."³ "B must be regarded as having preserved not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text, and that with comparatively small depravation either by scattered ancient corruptions otherwise attested or by individualisms of the scribe himself."⁴ "At a long interval after B, but hardly a less interval before all other manuscripts, stands **Σ**."⁵ "The text of **Σ** seems to be entirely, or all but entirely, Pre-Syrian."⁶ "The fourth century has bequeathed to us two manuscripts, of which even the less incorrupt must have been of exceptional purity among its own contemporaries."⁷ What utterly depraved and worthless copies of the New Testament its contemporaries, then, must have been! We fairly shudder at the thought of

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament in Greek*, p. 171.

² *Ibidem*, p. 150.

³ *The New Testament in Greek*, p. 557.

⁴ *Introduction*, etc., pp. 250, 251.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 171. One feels like stopping to take a long breath on coming to a statement like this.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 151. Another long breath needed.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 287.

the critical horrors from which we have been saved by the loss of those corrupt contemporaries of **N**! Westcott and Hort's belief is that, except in a very few instances, "the readings of **N** and **B** should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and that no readings of **N** and **B** can safely be rejected absolutely";¹ which, while furnishing a loop-hole of escape, implies that strong internal evidence can hardly be found to overcome their testimony.

These views of Westcott and Hort are also largely shared to-day by not a few in America as well as in England. Hence the frequent use in certain quarters of the phrase "the best texts," or "the preponderance of authorities," not meaning thereby the best, the purest, and most correct texts, or the preponderance of testimony obtainable from all the different sources within reach. What is meant by this language is simply the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices; or, at most, these two manuscripts and the handful of other documents that are for the most part in accord with them in their peculiar readings. Such an application of the expression "the best texts" is obviously a perversion of words. Properly speaking, the best texts are those that are freest from spurious and erroneous readings of every kind. But no careful, impartial, thorough comparison has ever been made among manuscripts to see which are really the best. As a general rule, it has been *assumed* that a certain manuscript was the best, and that others, more or less coinciding with that, were among the best. This, however, is simply a begging of the whole question. But let manuscripts be compared one with another with reference to what are known to be erroneous readings or are capable of being shown to be such, and let those in which the fewest number of false or spurious readings are found be pronounced the best, and we shall have something like a trustworthy standard of what is best among manuscripts and versions. When

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 225.

one of two manuscripts or versions is found habitually to contain what are obviously false readings, or readings that may be clearly shown to be false, we have a sound basis for judgment, and cannot err in deciding which of the two is the better text. But, as just intimated, this is a work that has never yet been performed, even with reference to any two documents. All that we have as yet is an estimate or judgment formed from a general study or examination of documents, enabling one to say, for example, that **B** presents a purer text than **N**, or **A** a better text than **D**. The true standard of relative excellence among manuscripts is yet to be ascertained, and the comparative superiority and value of documents to be determined.

Again, it is supposed by some that the science of textual criticism in reference to the New Testament is matured; that it admits of very few or no modifications or improvements; that the labors of textual critics hitherto have established principles that determine nearly all the questions that have arisen or may arise concerning the text; so that no trustworthy advance can now be made except in accordance with principles and methods already projected and explained, and that it is vain to look forward to any future recension of the text that will supersede the latest efforts of scholars in this direction. All this implies that there is a very general and hearty concurrence among students of the text in regard not only to the principles of criticism, but to the results attained by the application of those principles. But this can hardly be called an impartial, or even an intelligent, view of the subject.

The truth is, the Greek Text of the New Testament, in its present state, cannot be said to be settled. All modern editors are more or less at variance with each other; some of them, in different editions, are even at variance with themselves. This is due mainly to the principles, general and particular, on which they have proceeded. Of late years, the restoration of the so-called Ante-Nicene Text has been the professed aim of certain editors. But the making up of a text from fourth-

century manuscripts and ante-Nicene versions and writings alone can never give the text of the writers of the New Testament. In the first place, those manuscripts, versions, and writings are not in agreement among themselves; there is no such thing as a distinctively ante-Nicene or fourth-century text. In the second place, the earliest extant manuscripts and versions are all more or less depraved; so that if any one of them were taken and adhered to,—except where they are universally admitted to be in error,—as the basis of a correct text, the text thus obtained would be even more corrupt than any now in print. Again, were any two editors or companies of editors, altogether independent of each other, and without any communication, either direct or indirect, each with the other, to undertake a so-called restoration of the Text of the first century, or of any other of the early centuries, beyond what we already have, and have had for the last three centuries, there would probably be as much difference between the results of the labors of those two editors or companies of editors as between any two editions of the Greek New Testament now before the public. In fact, the critical study of the Greek Text of the New Testament, though dating back more than 350 years, is yet in its minority. The more one carefully and critically and reverently examines the printed text to which he may have access, though it be considered the best, the more deeply will he be convinced of this. There are errors not a few yet to be laid bare, and many corrections yet to be made, before the text can be properly regarded as settled. These errors are not of such a character as to affect in any appreciable degree the truths revealed; nor are the corrections such as to modify in the least the general trend and end of Scripture teaching. If their influence is felt in any degree upon the meaning of the Word, the thoughts embodied therein, it will be simply in removing obstructions, in shedding light on what may now be more or less obscure, in establishing and strengthening the believer's faith, and in rendering the New Testament as a whole even more clear,

more harmonious, more self-evidencing than it is now. But the means of detecting these errors are not peculiar to any one manuscript or set of manuscripts, however excellent may be its general character; for the true text of the New Testament is the possession of no one ancient document or set of documents, but is more or less held as a common possession among them. Hence, if we would know what that text really is, we should not limit our observations, as some do, to the readings of a few documents, but extend our views and researches to all the various sources of evidence within our reach. Here, then, is a field of investigation and labor deserving of profound attention, and worthy of the most consecrated energies of the Christian student. It is one that calls for earnest, loving, patient, persevering labor. If thus entered upon and explored with wisdom, freedom from bias, and an eye ever open for the truth, the results can hardly fail to be welcomed by all sincere lovers and genuine students of God's Word.

CONTENTS—VOL. II.

PROLEGOMENON	PAGE 3
READINGS EXAMINED:	
From John	11
From Acts	81
From Romans	140
From 1 Corinthians	177
From 2 Corinthians	192
From Galatians	202
From Ephesians	211
From Philippians	218
From Colossians	221
From 1 Thessalonians	230
From 2 Thessalonians	237
From 1 Timothy	239
From 2 Timothy	245
From Titus	249
From Philemon	251
From Hebrews	254
From James	272
From 1 Peter	278
From 1 John	283
From 2 John	294
From Jude	295
From Revelation	298
GENERAL INDEX	329
INDEX OF CITATIONS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT	344

JOHN.

i. 15.

THE reading, "This was he that said," to which the marginal note refers as found in some ancient copies in place of "This was he of whom I said," appears only in **Σ** as amended by its contemporary reviser (the original scribe having omitted the words), B first hand, and C first hand.¹ The reading, though adopted by Westcott and Hort with a dash before and another after it, is an error into which some early reader or scribe seems to have been betrayed by not finding any record that John had previously uttered the words that follow. But, being palpably false, it was subsequently corrected in all these manuscripts. It was the same circumstance that gave rise to the original reading of **Σ**, "This was he who, coming after me, is preferred before me"; which, though more plausible, is without other support. The common reading is, beyond doubt, the true one. It is abundantly attested by **Σ** as amended by a seventh-century corrector, A, B as amended by a sixth-century corrector (C third hand reads *ελεγον* instead of *ειπον*), D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, II, as well as all the cursives and ancient versions.

¹ In Huet's edition of Origen's Works, Vol. vi., 3, Origen is made to quote this passage with this reading, though other editions, in the same place as well as elsewhere, represent him as giving the evangelist's words according to the received reading.

i. 18.

On the reading *μονογενὴς Θεός*, "only-begotten God," referred to in the margin, and vouched for by **S**, B, C first hand, L, 33, the reader is referred to the able and exhaustive essays of the late Ezra Abbot, which may be found in the recently published volume of his writings entitled *Critical Essays* (Geo. H. Ellis, Boston), pp. 241-285. Dr. Scrivener concludes his remarks on this reading with saying that "the present is just such a case as calls for the interposition of the more recent uncial and cursive codices; and when we find that they all, with the single exception of Codex 33, defend the reading *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, we feel safe in concluding that for once Codices **S**, B, C, and the Peshito do not approach the autograph of S. John so nearly as Codex A, the Curetonian Syriac, and Old Latin versions."¹

i. 42.

Rec. T. *Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ* — Simon the son of Jona.

Rev. T. *Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου* — Simon the son of John.

The reading "son of John" is supported by **S**, B first hand (C and D are defective), L, 33, five manuscripts of the Old Latin, and four of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Roman Ethiopic, and Nonnus in his metrical paraphrase. The reading "son of Jona" is attested by A, B third hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, II, every cursive but one, *c* and *q* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic as represented by the manuscripts, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. The transcriber of the Old Latin manuscript *e*, being puzzled by the two readings, and not being able to decide between them, cut the Gordian knot by writing *frater Andreae*, "brother of Andrew," instead. We see no reason for blindly following the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts and their allies

here any more than in many other places. The reading *Ἰωάννου* (or, as B and the Revisers have it, *Ἰωάνου*) originated in a double error. In the first place *Ἰωνᾶ*, "Jonah," was mistaken or misread as *Ἰωανᾶ*, another form for *Ἰωάνου* or *Ἰωάννου*, from the nominative *Ἰωανᾶς*, as many manuscripts read in Luke iii. 27. Codex 69 has this very form *Ἰωανᾶ* at xxi. 17; and Codex 91 has *Ἰωανᾶ* in verses 15, 16, as well as in verse 17 of the same chapter. This error was the more readily committed by taking *υἱός* in the sense of disciple or follower, as in Matt. xii. 27 and Luke xi. 19, and frequently in the Septuagint, instead of its usual sense of son. This makes the true meaning of the Revisers' reading as given in the documents whence it comes, not "Simon the son of John," but "Thou art Simon as the disciple of John; thou shalt [henceforth] be called Cephas." But this, of course, is a false reading; and that such is the case is evident from the fact that Matthew (xvi. 17) reports Jesus as calling Peter, on an after occasion, "Simon, son of *Jonah*"; nor is there any difference among the manuscripts in this reading. But "Jonah" and "John" are names quite distinct one from the other in origin, signification, and form, the former meaning a dove, and the latter a gift from the Lord or given by the Lord. Notwithstanding the scholium cited by Tischendorf from the margin of Codex Tischendorfianus III., to the effect that in place of "Barjona" in Matt. xvi. 17, the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew has "the son of John," we cannot but think that the scholiast is in error, since the two names are not interchangeable. If Matthew was correct in reporting the Saviour as having called Peter the son of Jonah, and all manuscripts agree in this, the evangelist John, who knew Peter full as well, and could report his Master's words quite as correctly, as Matthew did, could not have confounded "Barjonah" with a name which to a Jew is so widely different from it as "Barjohn." The reading of "son of John" found in xxi. 15-17 is simply a reading conformed to this, supported by the same class of witnesses.

¹ *Introduction*, p. 606.

i. 49.

Rec. T. σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. — thou art the king of Israel.

Rev. T. σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. — thou art king of Israel.

There is no apparent reason why the Revisers should have adopted this reading on the testimony of A, B, L, two cursives, and possibly Epiphanius, — five witnesses or six at the most, — and not have adopted the reading *ὁψη* in verse 50, which is overwhelmingly supported, instead of *ὁψε*. It is true that neither change is essential to a revision of the English text, for the meaning is the same in either case in both places. But, for that matter, only a portion of the changes made by the Revisers in the original were necessary to a proper revision of the English. Many of them, like this, are evident departures from the original, and questionably attested at best; for there can be no doubt that Nathanael, after having said, "Thou *art* the Son of God," added, in the same natural order of words, "thou *art* the king of Israel." Only a lover of variety of expression would invert a part of the last clause, and make it read, "Thou king art of Israel," and at the same time omit the article as improper. John assuredly would not have so reported Nathanael. That he did not, is abundantly testified by the supporters of the common text, — namely, **Σ** (C and D are defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, all the versions, Epiphanius according to one codex (though not according to another), Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret.

i. 51.

Rec. T. ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφώτα, — hereafter ye shall see heaven open.

Rev. T. ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφώτα, — Ye shall see the heaven opened.

The common reading here is attested by A (C and D are defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the

cursives, *ε*, *q* of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Augustine. On the other hand, ἀπ' ἄρτι is wanting in **Σ**, B, L, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen two or three times, and Epiphanius and Cyril each once. Its presence is attributed by some to its being introduced from Matt. xxvi. 64. But it is more probably a part of the original text, early omitted through failure to perceive its applicableness. The word means not "after this" or "hereafter," as the A. V. has it, but "from this time," "henceforth." And as the language connected with it was taken literally and misunderstood, the expression was piously omitted as unsuitable. But a true understanding of Jesus' symbolic language here reveals the word to be a significant and important one in its true sense of "henceforward" or "from this time onward."

ii. 11.

Rec. T. ταύτην ἐποίησεν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. — This beginning of miracles did Jesus.

Rev. T. ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. — This beginning of his signs did Jesus.

The Revisers' omission of the article is in accordance with A, B, L, T^b, Α, 1, 33, 262, Origen, Eusebius according to some codices, Chrysostom in one place, and the Paschal Chronicle. But its presence is called for by **Σ**, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, all but three cursives, Eusebius in another place, Chrysostom in two other places, and Cyril of Alexandria. One of the principles of Greek composition also makes the presence of the article necessary, if the rendering of the Revisers presents the exact meaning of the evangelist. That principle is, that a noun limited by a demonstrative pronoun must be preceded by the article. It is not to be supposed that John could have omitted the article. If his meaning had been "Jesus wrought this as a beginning of miracles," he might have

written τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. But the only legitimate Greek for "this beginning" is either τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην or the Greek of the Received Text. And yet that Greek must needs be revised to have a correct basis for a proper English version!

ii. 12.

Rec. T. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, — his brethren.

Rev. T. οἱ ἀδελφοί, — *his* brethren.

"A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work," again. So says the Revisers' Preface. But a literal translation of the text here would make the corresponding revised English rendering read "his mother, and the brethren, and his disciples"; or rather, as the reading was probably meant to be taken, "his mother and the brethren, even his disciples." The reading "the brethren" is supported by B, L, T^b, three copies of the Old Latin, and Origen in four different places. But L, T^b, and Origen in three of those places also read "and the disciples," — making the consistent reading "his mother, and brethren, and disciples"; while **Σ**, six cursives, two of those three Old Latin manuscripts in common with four others, and the Armenian Version omit "and his disciples" altogether. The pronoun ("his") in connection with "brethren," is vouched for by **Σ**, A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Cyril of Alexandria. It is not at all probable that Luke, in writing three nouns in succession coupled together as here, should have limited only the first and the last of the three with "his," when the intermediate one required that limitation just as truly as the last of the trio. The absence of the pronoun is due, not to its non-insertion by Luke, but to its being dropped by some one to whom the idea of Jesus'

having brothers, in the common acceptance of that word, was offensive. It is the work of an early believer in the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. There need be no doubt as to the true reading, that of the Received Text being abundantly attested.

ii. 15.

Rec. T. ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα — poured out the money.

Rev. T. ἐξέχεε τὰ κέρματα — poured out the money.

There is no difference in the meaning of the two readings; so that the change was not necessary to the revision of the English Version. Tischendorf, and Lachmann in his text, adopt the former; Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, the latter. The former is attested by **Σ**, A (C and D defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, every cursive but one, all but two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Nonnus. The latter is the reading of B, L, T^b, X, 33, δ, γ of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Origen in a number of places. B, X, Π second hand, ten or twelve cursives, and Origen, as well as Cyril, also read ἀνέστρεψεν at the end of the verse, — a reading which no modern editors, however, except Westcott and Hort, adopt as genuine instead of ἀνέστρεψεν, though they might do it with almost as good reason as to adopt the plural here instead of the singular, — a form that was introduced under the false idea that it was more appropriate than the singular to use in connection with ἐξέχεε, "*poured out*."

iii. 13.

The "many ancient authorities" that "omit *which is in heaven*" from the end of this verse are **Σ**, B, L, T^b, 33, one manuscript of the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Cyril and Origen each once, simply because it did not serve their purpose to quote the words. The omission, for such it is, was

due to the apparent inconsistency of Jesus' being reported as speaking of himself as the Son of man "who is in heaven" when he was in Palestine. Of course, the words are thrown out of the text by Westcott and Hort; but they are retained by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and other modern editors. The evidence in support of their genuineness is simply overwhelming. They are found in A, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, ΙΙ, all the cursives but one (though Codices 80 and 88 change "in heaven" to "from heaven"), every copy of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, all four of the Syriac Versions, all but one manuscript of the Memphitic, and the Armenian Version. In addition to this, the words are attested as genuine by Hippolytus, Origen according to his Latin interpreter very expressly, Dionysius of Alexandria, Didymus, Basil the Great, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Eustathius, Theodoret, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and other Greek Fathers, not to mention a long list of Latin Fathers. One thing is certain, that, while it is easy to account for the omission of these words, they probably would not have got into the text if they had not been genuine.

iii. 16.

Rec. T. πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν . . . ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — whosoever believeth in him should . . . have eternal life.

Rev. T. πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. [Margin: "Or, *believeth in him may have.*"]

The only Greek manuscripts in support of the Revisers' reading ἐν αὐτῷ are B and T^b. These are seconded, however, by three copies of the Old Latin, and seven manuscripts of the Vulgate. The common reading is attested by Ⲛ (A has ἐπ' αὐτόν instead), E, F, G, H, K (L has ἐπ' αὐτῷ), M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, ΙΙ, all the cursives, five copies of the Old Latin Version, the printed Vulgate as well as several of its manu-

script copies, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Lucifer, and others. The readings of A and L, which can only mean "on him," and therefore cannot be taken with ἔχῃ as the Revisers in the text take "in him," are in support of the common reading, — "whosoever believeth on him." This form of words (πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν) appears again in verses 18, 36, as well as in verse 16. In fact, it is the evangelist's invariable formula for expressing belief on or in Jesus; so that the Revisers' marginal rendering "believeth in him," though a legitimate translation of their Greek, is the rendering of a form of words which John nowhere uses in expressing that thought. The revised reading is apparently an attempt on the part of some early critic to introduce variety, or possibly to bring the evangelist's language here into correspondence with chap. i. 4. The order of the words, however, is an unnatural one for expressing the thought. Compare xx. 31. The reading may safely be regarded a false one.

iii. 17.

Rec. T. τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ — his Son.

Rev. T. τὸν υἱόν — the Son.

The omission of "his" here is the work of the same hand that omitted it in the preceding verse. There, however, the omission is supported only by Ⲛ first hand and B. Here it is favored by two additional uncials, L, T^b, and five cursives. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort may be consistent in omitting αὐτοῦ from both verses, though in neither verse is there sufficient evidence or good reason for doing it.

iii. 31.

A marginal note says that "some ancient authorities read *he that cometh from heaven beareth witness of what he hath seen and heard.*" In other words, Ⲛ first hand, D, the four

cursives, 1, 22, 118, 473, six manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, the Curetonian Syriac, and the Armenian omit "is above all," together with the words "and" and "this" in the next verse. On this testimony, Tischendorf adopts the reading; while Westcott and Hort place it in the margin as a secondary reading, which in their judgment may possibly be the true one. But it bears too palpable marks of being an attempted improvement of the evangelist's language, and is too feebly attested to deserve consideration. It is plain enough that the words might have been omitted from a desire to avoid a seemingly unnecessary repetition. If they are not genuine, it is difficult to see any temptation for introducing them in this connection.

iv. 9.

The sentence "For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans" is noted as one which "some ancient authorities omit." But such marginal notes are uncalled for. The clause is omitted only by $\aleph$ first hand, D, and three copies of the Old Latin Version. It is true, Tischendorf regards it as a gloss, and omits it; and Westcott and Hort seem to be in doubt, and enclose it in brackets. But it was evidently omitted lest ignorant readers might consider it a part of the Samaritan woman's words to Jesus, instead of a parenthetical explanation thrown in by the evangelist. As he was not writing for Jews, he very naturally inserted the clause to account for the woman's remark, just as he inserted verse 8 to show why Jesus asked the woman for a drink. Its genuineness is abundantly attested by $\aleph$ as amended by the original scribe or his "proof-reader," A, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, T^b, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and all the other ancient versions. It is consequently retained by Lachmann, Tregelles, and modern editors generally.

v. 3.

Rec. T. πλήθος πολὺ — a great multitude.

Rev. T. πλήθος — a multitude.

The omission of "great" is according to $\aleph$, B, C, D, L, 33, 68, five copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Ethiopic, and Chrysostom twice. But the word may have been early dropped on account of the apparent extravagance of speaking of the sick who occupied the five porches as "a great multitude." Whatever might have been done elsewhere, it seems altogether improbable that any one would ever have been tempted to insert the word here if not genuine. It is evidently used to denote a comparatively great number, a large number for the place, or in comparison with the number usually there. In this sense, it appears to be a part of the original text, and is attested as such by A, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , nearly all the cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Cyril of Alexandria, and Chrysostom in two other places, — which fact not only neutralizes his testimony in favor of the omission, but really indicates that the evangelist wrote not merely "a multitude" but "a great multitude."

v. 3, 4.

Rec. T. ἐκδεχομένων . . . νοσήματι. — waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.

Rev. T. omits; but the margin says that "many ancient authorities insert" these words, "wholly or in part."

The entire passage, which consists of the last clause of verse 3, and the whole of verse 4, is wanting in $\aleph$, B, C first hand, 157, 314, 7 of the old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, the Thebaic, and one manuscript of the Memphitic Version, — altogether, less

than ten documents. In addition to these, D, 33, *f*, *l* of the Old Latin, a few manuscripts of the Vulgate, and several of the Armenian Version, unite in omitting the fourth verse, and only this; while A first hand, L, 18, omit simply the last clause of the third verse, — “waiting for the moving of the waters.” This clause, however, is supported by A second hand, C third hand, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π (this last having asterisks attached, to denote omission by some), nearly all the cursives, eight manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, one edition of the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, as well as Chrysostom twice, Cyril, and Nonnus in his free paraphrastic way. The genuineness of verse 4 is quite as strongly attested by A, C third hand, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, S with asterisks, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ with obeli hinting suspicion, Π as before with asterisks, most of the cursives, some of them marked with asterisks, and some with obeli, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Jerusalem, and Philoxenian Syriac (though in the last the latter half of the verse is marked with obeli), Wilkins’ Memphitic, the printed copies of the Armenian, Chrysostom and Ambrose each twice, Cyril, Tertullian, and Didymus, — with some verbal differences (most of which are easily accounted for) among the documents. This, however, is not an uncommon thing in some of the best attested passages, as Luke ix. 25, xvi. 27, and many others. In regard to the documentary evidence, all that we can truly say is, that it is divided; there is nothing really conclusive as to either reading. To decide the question, we need to look further, and consider the probabilities.

It is said by the advocates of the Revised Text that verse 4 was inserted to explain the statement in verse 7 about the troubling of the water. If the account given in verse 4 was foisted into the text, as some suppose, whence was it derived? who would have inserted it? It speaks for itself that it is the offspring of a *Jewish* mind. But Jews were not among the

transcribers and early emendators of the New-Testament writings. Josephus records no such account. Neither he nor any other ancient author within our knowledge gives any intimation that the Jews had any legend or story of the kind. Moreover, the words themselves forbid our viewing them as the record of a superstitious conceit, much less of a natural occurrence. Verse 4 is evidently designed to state a supernatural or miraculous event. The water was agitated by an angel. *Whoever* after that *first* stepped in was at once cured, *whatever* may have been his disease or trouble. Only one, and that the first one after the disturbance of the water, could be healed. *No matter what* his trouble was, he was *invariably* and *instantly* cured. It will not do to say that “the water was found at certain intervals to be impregnated with gases which gave it a *strengthening* property, and this was sufficient to *attract* many sufferers.” To speak thus is to lose sight of the point altogether. The water not only possessed at times a property which attracted many sufferers, but was endued with power to *cure* every one who first availed himself of it after it had been imparted to the water, *whatever* his disease may have been. That property was not merely strengthening; it healed at once, and yet healed but one. As Dr. Bloomfield says, “the circumstances of the narration utterly exclude the notion of anything short of miraculous agency.” There is no attempt at attributing the cures to natural causes. The efficacy of the pool, the time, and mode of its curing are considered and represented as results of divine agency. But the writer, instead of saying that God troubled the water, in perfect Jewish style says, “an angel troubled” it. Just so Matthew says (xxviii. 2), “An angel of the Lord rolled away the stone” from before the sepulchre; and Paul speaks of the law (Gal. iii. 19) as “ordained through angels,” and (Heb. ii. 2) as “the word spoken by angels.” Angels were the agents by whom God wrought. And it is in that sense that the writer speaks here of an angel as troubling the water. It accords with the teaching of scrip-

ture generally, to the effect that angels are the invisible instruments of good to men. So that this way of stating the fact, however different from the manner in which we would naturally express ourselves, is not to be wondered at, much less to be considered as essentially unscriptural and unworthy of acceptance as a part of the evangelist's record. Again, on reading the narrative with this passage omitted, there may be no apparent break in going from the middle of verse 3 to verse 5, as in the text of the R. V. But, in reading on and coming to verse 6, and finding that at least one of this multitude of invalids and sufferers had been there *a long time*, the reader naturally wonders why this should be so. The next verse explains the mystery in part, though very enigmatically, it must be confessed: "I have no man, *when the water is troubled*, to put me into the pool; but, while I am coming, another steppeth in before me." Yet, even here, the question naturally arises, What does this troubling of the water mean? and why does he speak of having himself put into the pool? Now if the omitted passage were not genuine, *here* is just where a corrector or reviser of the text would naturally have inserted it, in order to explain the poor cripple's meaning. But we find no trace of anything of the kind in this connection among the manuscripts or other ancient documents. None but the original writer, in anticipation of what he was about to say, would have inserted the passage where it occurs. It certainly comes in very naturally, and presents no appearance of having been interpolated. Similar introductory remarks, designed to prepare the reader for some following statement or incident, not unfrequently appear in this and the other Gospels. Thus, in Mark v. 24, we read that much people followed Jesus, "and thronged him," preparing the reader for the disciple's words, in verse 31, "Thou seest the multitude *thronging* thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?" Compare Luke viii. 42, 45. So, too, in Luke ii. 26, the statement that it was revealed to Simeon that he should not die till "he had seen the Lord's Anointed," is given in order to prepare

the reader for the words in verse 29, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, *according to thy word*." Other instances appear in John ii. 1, "And the mother of Jesus was there," — a remark introduced to prepare the way for verse 3; vi. 2, "And a great multitude followed him," preparing the reader for the statement in verse 5, "And seeing that a *great multitude was coming* to him"; vi. 23, "But other boats came from Tiberias," — designed to prepare the way for the statement made in verse 24, "they also took shipping"; ix. 14, "And it was the Sabbath day when Jesus made the clay," in anticipation of the record of the Pharisees' words, verse 16, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." Also xi. 18, in view of the fact mentioned in verse 19, and perhaps those given in verses 45, 46, 47. [The only real reason why any consider the passage before us as spurious is that it is wanting in less than ten documents, while its presence in the rest of the documents, consisting of several hundred from all parts of Christendom, is thought to be due to a desire to explain verse 7.] But this is an untenable position. Besides, the phraseology of verse 4 shows that that verse was penned after verse 3, — and penned because the last clause of verse 3 called for explanation; for verse 4 explains, not why so many impotent persons were lying round the pool, but why they were waiting for the moving of the water. This being the case, the testimony of A first hand, L, and 18, against the last clause of verse 3 amounts to nothing. The fact of their attesting the genuineness of verse 4 is of itself a virtual attestation of the genuineness of the clause which gave rise to this verse, but which they have omitted. And the chief verbal alterations found in this verse among these manuscripts are due to their omission of that clause. [Now, if these three manuscripts misrepresent the text here, as they obviously do, why may not the eight or nine documents which omit verse 4 as well as this clause do the same? And, if these give a false text by omitting this clause, it is by no means impossible or even improbable that

they err, and misrepresent the evangelist by omitting verse 4 also. In fact, the internal evidence, to say the least, is very strongly against them. With all our natural repugnance to this passage, and our first impressions in favor of its omission, and our readiness to find good grounds for rejecting it from the narrative, we cannot persuade ourselves that it is spurious.¹ *abc*

v. 44.

The "ancient authorities" referred to in the marginal note as omitting the word "God," and reading "The glory that is from the only, ye seek not," are the one Greek manuscript B, two copies of the Old Latin, one edition of the Memphitic, some manuscripts of the Armenian, and Origen in one place. Its omission is easily accounted for. In the exemplar from which the Vatican or some closely related manuscript was taken, the three words $\mu\acute{o\nu\omicron\nu\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon$ read MONOYΘYΟΥ with the stenographic symbol or horizontal stroke above the letters

¹ The writer has seen somewhere an attempt to explain this passage as follows: The evangelist's word "an angel" is taken to denote a messenger from the temple, — one of the Levites. At the time of offering the daily sacrifices, that is, every morning and evening, he went down into the pool, into which the blood of the beasts slain for the sacrifices was supposed to have run, and stirred the water so as to make it sure that all the blood and other impurities had run out of the pool, and not settled there to defile the place. After that, whoever first stepped into the water was healed, no matter what his trouble was; the healing being considered the result of his faith in the efficacy of the blood of the slaughtered animals. — This attempt at explanation is a pure conjecture; and its absurdity is apparent. The evangelist says that "a great multitude" of impotent folk lay there, waiting for the moving of the water. But this could hardly be if the pool was disturbed twice a day, enabling more than 700 persons to be cured every year. Yet here was a man who had been there "a long time," probably for years, and had been unable to be cured. If the angel had gone down "daily" into the pool, the evangelist would probably have said so, instead of saying "at a certain season." Besides, where was the efficacy of the blood after it had all run out of the pool? And how could any one have faith in it to cure him, when it was not there?

probably very faint, or obliterated, or altogether omitted; and the Θ being mistaken for an O, ΘY , i.e. $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, was dropped as superfluous. The omission, if found in almost any other manuscript, would not be considered worth noticing. No modern editor of the Greek New Testament omits the word; nor do any consider it necessary to enclose it in brackets, except Westcott and Hort.

vi. 14.

"Some ancient authorities read *signs*," says the marginal note. Only two Greek manuscripts (B, and the fragment Θ^s of the sixth century), α of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic and Armenian Versions here read "the *signs*" or miracles instead of "the *sign*" or miracle which Jesus did. The singular, of course, refers to the act of feeding the multitude from five loaves and two fishes, and still having twelve baskets of fragments left. But the plural seems to have been introduced from verse 2, with the design of including together with this miracle those that Jesus had previously wrought, — so representing the remark recorded immediately after as made not in view of or in consequence of this miracle only, but in view of his miracles generally up to this time. The context, however, forbids the idea that such was the evangelist's meaning, and consequently that he expressed himself in the plural here. The plural, however, being found in B, is introduced into the text by Westcott and Hort. Hence the Revisers' marginal note.

vi. 47.

Rec. T. $\delta\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \zeta\omega\eta\nu\ \alpha\lambda\omega\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. — He that believeth on me, hath everlasting life.

Rev. T. $\delta\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \zeta\omega\eta\nu\ \alpha\lambda\omega\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. — He that believeth hath eternal life.

The latter reading is supported by $\aleph$, B, L, T, and Zohrab's edition and a few manuscripts of the Armenian Version; the former, by A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , II, the

whole body of the cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, Usan's Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Cyril of Alexandria, and Hilary. The Curetonian Syriac, in its own peculiar way, translates the evangelist's words, "He that believeth *on God*," etc. The shorter reading seems to be an early clipping down of the text that found a somewhat wider acceptance than the same omission in chap. iv. 39, which is perpetuated in the cursive 570, *a* and *e* of the Old Latin, and Origen once; or than that in chap. xi. 45, the only extant support for which is C second hand. The omission of the phrase "on him" here is altogether unlike John, and is not favored by the context. The verse, in fact, is a repetition, in the form of a solemn asseveration, of what Jesus had already said in verse 40. Having answered the murmurings of the Jews referred to in verses 41, 42, he returns in this verse to the subject he had already introduced; and there is no apparent reason why he should have omitted the important words "on me," or why the evangelist should have recorded him as having omitted them, contrary to the all but overwhelming attestation of the various witnesses capable of being appealed to. Indeed, the emphatic ἐγώ, "I," with which the next verse begins—"I am the bread of life"—implies a reference to and confirmation of the declaration "He that believeth *on me* hath eternal life." The omission of these words certainly has a suspicious appearance, and is too feebly vouched for to be accepted as genuine. Among modern editors, besides the Revisers, Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort are the only ones, as far as we are aware, that really consider the words spurious.

vi. 51.

Rec. T. ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἢ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. — the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Rev. T. ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἢ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. — yea, the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.

The two oldest extant Greek manuscripts are by no means agreed in the readings of this verse. In the Sinaitic manuscript, the second clause reads, "If any one eat of my bread, he shall live for ever." In this reading, **Σ** is joined by *a* and *e* of the Old Latin Version, and by Eusebius, Cyprian, and Hilary. Notwithstanding the feeble attestation in support of this reading, Tischendorf adopts it as the true one, though he is constrained to say that the common reading, "this bread," is the more suitable. In the Vatican manuscript, this clause reads as in the Received Text. The clause before us, the Sinaitic manuscript gives thus,—"The bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh." The Vatican manuscript, however, gives it as it appears in the Revised Text. Now it is very certain that at least one of these manuscripts has given us a false text, even if it is one of the oldest known manuscripts of the Greek Testament; for both of these readings cannot be genuine. And, if one of them must be more or less false, it is not impossible that both may be. The order in which the words of this clause appear in **Σ** is evidently due to a desire to give to the phrase "for the life of the world" the place which seemed to belong to it after omitting the words "which I shall give." In B, these last words are simply omitted as superfluous, because they occur just before. There can be but little question on this point, though the reading is also attested by C, D, L, T, three cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Origen twice, Athanasius, Cyril, and Cyprian. The common reading, "Yea, and the bread that I shall give is my flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world," is every way like John; while the loosely-jointed form in which the words are given in the R. V. is unnatural and altogether unlike him. The former is evidently the source of the other two readings, and as such must be regarded as the true reading. If that of the Sinaitic manuscript were the original reading, no other would ever have been proposed. If that of the Vatican manuscript were the reading

given by the evangelist, we may be assured that the common reading would never have appeared, but that the reading of the Sinaitic Codex would have been more widely adopted and preserved. It is simply because the common reading is the true reading that it has come down to us. Codex A is defective here; but this reading is well attested as genuine by E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and by Clement of Alexandria, Origen twice, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret at least seven times.

vi. 71.

Rec. T. τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην. — Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.

Rev. T. τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου. — Judas the son of Simon Iscariot.

The difference between the two texts is simply in the application of the term "Iscariot," which is generally regarded as meaning a man of Carioth or from Kerioth. The question is, to which of the two persons,—to the father or to the son,—was the name really applied by the evangelist. Before proceeding to consider the testimony of the manuscripts, we desire to notice one or two other points. The first is that in all the other Gospels the name is applied to the son, and to him only, the father's name not being given in any of them. In Luke xxii. 3, the son is spoken of as "Judas, who was called (or, as some manuscripts read, was surnamed) Iscariot." Three of the evangelists are thus agreed in applying the name to Judas. How is it with the fourth? In John xii. 4, all the witnesses are united in applying the name to Judas,—some calling him simply "Judas Iscariot"; others, "Simon's [son] Judas Iscariot"; and still others, "Judas Simon Iscariot"; while the

Codex Bezae (D) calls him "Judas from Carioth." Again, in xiv. 22, Judas, the brother of James, is, in nearly all the manuscripts, spoken of as "not Iscariot," which implies that there was another Judas among them who was surnamed Iscariot. D reads "Judas not from Carioth," which amounts to the same thing. In Münster's fragments of the Thebaic Version, "Judas not Iscariot" reads "Judas the Canaanite," while the Curetonian Syriac, in its own peculiar style, calls him "Judas Thomas." But this, while displaying one of the singularities of these old versions, in no way impairs the otherwise unanimous testimony in regard to the implied application in this connection of the name "Iscariot" to Judas the betrayer of Christ. In xiii. 2, nearly all the ancient documents apply the name to Judas,—some calling him "Judas Iscariot, Simon's son"; others, "Judas Simon Iscariot"; and two or three others, "Judas from Carioth." Only L, M, g of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Armenian Version apply "Iscariot" to the father here. Origen in the manuscripts of his writings speaks only of "Judas Iscariot the son of Simon," though in his printed works he is twice made to speak otherwise. In three of the five passages in which the name is employed by John, the documentary testimony may therefore be considered as nearly unanimous in applying the surname "Iscariot" to Judas, and not to his father. In xiii. 26, the Received Text reads "to Judas Iscariot [son] of Simon," which is the reading of A, E, G, H, K, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π first hand, most of the cursives, eight manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Clementine Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, Origen in six different places, and Cyril; while D has "from Carioth," leaving it doubtful whether the phrase should be applied to the father or to the son. Two or three cursives, four copies of the Old Latin and two of the Vulgate read "to Judas Simon Iscariot." The Revisers' Text in that verse has "to Judas [son] of Simon Iscariot," which is the reading of S, B, C, I^b, L, M, X, Π second hand, six cursives, one manuscript of the Old Latin, and four

of the Vulgate. In the verse before us, the received reading is that of E, F, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, A, II first hand, nearly all the cursives, the printed Vulgate, the Gothic, and Cyril. (A is defective here.) D and several Old Latin manuscripts read "Judas Scarioth [son] of Simon," or "Judas Simon Iscariot." The Sinaitic Codex first hand, the lost uncial represented by Ferrar's group, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac have "from Carioth," which may be applied to either father or son. The Revisers' Text is supported by **Σ**'s earlier seventh-century emendator, B, C, G, L, II second hand (though the other reading is afterward restored), one cursive, five or six manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, the Armenian, and possibly the Curetonian Syriac, and the two Egyptian versions. In both of these instances, the external evidence being divided, we are left to the internal evidence to aid us in deciding what the true reading is. And since "Iscariot" appears in each of the other Gospels as the surname of Judas, and is accepted as such in three other places in this Gospel, it is but reasonable to conclude that, in the remaining two passages in which the documentary evidence is nearly evenly divided, the evangelist applied the name, not to the father, but as elsewhere, to the son. There is really no apparent reason why he should have applied it to the father in these two places, when he clearly applies it to Judas in all the others. The difference in readings between the two forms "Judas Iscariot, son of Simon" and "Judas, son of Simon Iscariot" is a difference of only two letters in the Greek; and, when we consider the position of the words, the Revisers' reading is easily accounted for. In the original, in documents in which the word "Simon" appears, that word generally stands between "Judas" and the surname "Iscariot." But, as already seen, some manuscripts read "Judas Simon Iscariot"; that is, the word "Simon," instead of being in the genitive, is put in the same case with "Iscariot," and in apposition with "Judas." Thus, in xii. 4, F, G, H, U, some cursives, two or

three copies of the Old Latin, and Wilkins' Memphitic read "Judas Simon Iscariot," and in xiii. 26, Codices 13, 101, 346, four copies of the Old Latin and two of the Vulgate read "Judas Simon Iscariot." That is, "Simon" is conformed in case to "Iscariot." These, however, are discarded on all hands as false readings. In other instances, "Iscariot" is put in apposition with "Simon," which immediately precedes it, and is therefore conformed in case to it. Hence "Iscariot," in some manuscripts, appears divorced from "Judas," and is not unnaturally, yet improperly, made a surname of Simon instead; as in I, M, one copy of the Old Latin, and the Armenian, — reading "Judas (son of) Simon Iscariot," in xiii. 2; also in **Σ**, B, C, I^b, L, and other documents, as already shown, in xiii. 26; and in **Σ** as amended by its earlier seventh century corrector, B, C, etc., in the verse before us. This reading, the Revisers and some modern editors have adopted in these last two places, but not in xiii. 2, though it is the same erroneous reading in all three of them, only that in two of them it was somewhat more widely adopted among the manuscripts than in the third. The fact that three or four of the oldest extant manuscripts together with a few other documents contain this reading, instead of being any evidence of its genuineness, is simply an evidence that the documents in which a reading so transparently false is found are not altogether above suspicion, and that even their combined testimony is not to be implicitly received.

vii. 8.

The second clause of this verse reads, "I go not up yet unto this feast." A marginal note says, "Many ancient authorities omit *yet*"; and the American Revisers adopt this reading, — "I go not up to this feast." It is vouched for by **Σ**, D, K, M, II, 17 second hand, 389, 570, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Curetonian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Porphyry, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alex-

andria, and Jerome; while that of the text, "not yet," is attested by B, E, F, G, H, L, S, T, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, A, nearly all the cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, some manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Thebaic, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and Basil. (A and C are defective.) Documentary testimony as well as intrinsic probability here preponderates in favor of the accepted reading; for it is incredible that Jesus said "I am not going up to this feast," and yet, immediately after, went up. At the same time, there is no probability that any transcriber intentionally or knowingly changed "not yet" to "not." The probability from this point of view is wholly the other way. So that many able critics consider "not" to be really the evangelist's word, and "not yet" to have been introduced in its place in order to reconcile the utterance of Jesus with recorded facts. It will not do to say, with some, that the difference in meaning, caused by the omission of "yet," is immaterial; that the verb is in the present, and that therefore Jesus really means "I go not up at present," leaving it uncertain whether or not he intended to go up later. Such a meaning cannot, by any fair interpretation of the words, be given to them if Jesus really said "I go not up to this feast." This is an absolute disclaiming of any intention to be present at that feast; the negative applies not to the idea of time, but to that of going as connected with this particular feast. In the phrase "not yet," however, the negative refers directly to the time expressed by the enclitic, and not to the meaning of the verb except through "yet." The supposition that Jesus said "I go not up to this feast," with some such unexpressed, underlying thought as "with you," or "publicly," or "as the Messiah," or "for the purpose for which you would have me go," is utterly inadmissible. It is not like Christ. Nor can we conclude that he was bidden by the Spirit to go sooner than he expected, and for this reason went, though he had said he was not going. Such a view is inconsistent with his manifestly constant fulness of the Spirit and possession of divine prescience.

Nor can the supposition be admitted that Jesus, for some other reason, or in any respect, changed his mind. We have no evidence that he changed his intention on any other occasion, not even during his interview with the Syrophenician woman, nor as he drew near to Emmaus on the evening after his resurrection. Nor can we take his words in the sense of "I am not going up *to observe* this feast, but for another purpose." This would misplace the negation ["I am going up *not to observe*" etc.], and render unmeaning the words that follow. Besides, the idea of observance does not lie in the words "unto the feast," either in this or any other place. These are all mere shifts to find a good meaning in a false reading occurring in documents which some seem disposed to consider as incapable of uniting in a false reading, especially if that reading is a hard one.—The Saviour, no doubt, said just what he meant when he declared: "I am not yet going up to this feast"; and the entire connection is in accord with this declaration. His brethren evidently comprehended his meaning. They expressed no surprise whatever in seeing him at the feast, which would hardly have been the case had he said he was not going thither.—Now, as Dr. Hort very truly says,¹ "all conflicts between intrinsic and transcriptional probability arise from the imperfection of our knowledge." If we knew the real character of many of the transcribers of the old manuscripts of the New Testament, and realized their unfitness for the task they were engaged in, we might have less confidence in the result of their labors, and the testimony of their manuscripts. Let us see what are our leading witnesses in favor of "not." (1) The Sinaitic Codex, which gives evidences from beginning to end of having been carelessly written, "the whole manuscript being disfigured by corrections"; and (2) the Codex Bezae, which has confessedly a "singularly corrupt text," and is in many respects a very untrustworthy witness. To give the reader some idea of how little

¹ *Introduction*, p. 26.

we can rely on this as a genuine reading because of its being found in these manuscripts, we note in passing that only two verses previous to this (in verse 6), the scribe of the Sinaitic Codex gives as the true reading, "My time is not come," instead of "not yet" come, — the very mistake he makes in this verse. In Rev. xvii. 12, he gives οὕτω, "thus," instead of οὕτω, "not yet." In John viii. 57, D changes οὕτω to οὐδέπω, though without changing the meaning. In John xi. 30, it changes οὕτω to οὐ, just as in the passage before us, — making the record read, "Jesus was *not* (instead of *not yet*) come into the village." Now, as these changes were effected in other places, why should not οὕτω be changed to οὐκ here! We do not say the change was intentionally made; but we have no doubt that it was made. With such copyists as the transcribers of some of the old manuscripts, it would be no difficult thing to write οὐκ instead of οὕτω while the influence of the preceding negatives still lingered upon the mind, or to mistake ΟΥΤΩ, standing at the end of a line, for ΟΥΚ, overlooking the omega written in a diminutive and possibly obscure form after the Π, as it was often written. In some such way as this, it is by no means improbable that "not" crept into the text; and the sentence that immediately follows rather favors this reading: "And having spoken thus to them, he remained in Galilee"; *i.e.* he did *not* go up to the feast with them. The error having crept in, and that too in a very early manuscript, it would of course be almost necessarily transmitted in subsequent copies, and be more or less widely circulated. — An additional consideration that seems to call for "not yet" as the genuine reading is the statement that follows: "For my time is not yet come," *i.e.* not for going up to *Jerusalem*, but for going up "to this feast," as his brethren obviously understood it. It is true, they had been urging him to go up to Jerusalem to show himself openly before his disciples, and let his claims be known. To that, he had already replied in verse 6: "My time [for doing this] is not yet come." A moment or two after, he says to them, "Go ye up to the feast;

I am not yet going to this feast, for my time [for going] is not yet fully come." "Ye" and "I" are emphatic, — the two clauses being in strong contrast, indicating that the statement was made to satisfy his brethren that, while their time for going to the feast had come, his had not. Omit "yet," and Jesus is made to say that he is not going at all to that feast. Οὕτω therefore is obviously needed to express his meaning. When this is taken in connection with what has already been presented, it seems impossible to do otherwise than to reject the simple "not" as a false reading. And so Lachmann has done, as well as Westcott and Hort, who stand by the Received Text in this instance, we presume because of their partiality for B, especially as it is supported by L, rather than for other reasons, though they improperly place "not" in the margin, just as the Canterbury Revisers do.

vii. 42.

Rec. T. ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; — Christ cometh.

Rev. T. ἔρχεται ὁ Χριστός; — the Christ cometh.

The order of the words in the Greek has no effect on the meaning or the rendering. The Received Text, which presents the words in the same order in which they occur in the end of the preceding verse as vouched for by all Greek manuscripts, gives the words in the order in which they appear in **Σ**, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Η, nearly every cursive, five copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Origen. The Revisers' Text follows the arrangement of B, L, T, 33, *c* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Jerusalem Syriac, and Cyril. The Peshito Syriac, the Clementine Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and two copies of the Old Latin, both here and at the close of the preceding verse, have the words in the order in which they stand in the Revisers' Text, — "cometh the Christ." No argument therefore can be drawn from them as to the true order,

which in verse 41 is certainly the reverse of this ; for, as the words are transposed there in these versions, they are likely to be transposed here also. But, as Tischendorf says, the arrangement of B, L, T, etc., "seems to be a transposition made with a view to separate the words *Δαβίδ* and *ὁ Χριστός*," so that no one should be in danger of reading the passage, "For he cometh of the seed of David, from Bethlehem, the village where *David the Anointed* was." In confirmation of this, we find that, while D and the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions retain the arrangement *ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται*, they place the words in other parts of the verse, that is, away from *Δαβίδ*, while the Old Latin Version *ε* omits *ὁ Χριστός*, and follows "David" immediately with the verb "he cometh." The revised arrangement is a transparent alteration of the evangelist's words.

vii. 46.

Rec. T. Οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος. — Never man spake like this man.

Rev. T. Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος. — Never man so spake.

The position given to οὕτως, "so," in the Revised Text may be correct. But the propriety of omitting as spurious the words "like this man," is questionable. Tischendorf not only adopts these words, but inserts λαλεῖ, "speaks," after οὗτος. The revised reading is found in *Σ* as amended early in the seventh century, B, L, T, 225, 229 first hand, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Memphitic Version, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria. The common reading is given by *Σ* first hand, D (omitting ὁ ἄνθρωπος at the end of the clause), E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. (A is still defective.) One would hardly have been tempted to add the words, "like this man," for they are wholly unnecessary ; but they might very naturally

have been, and apparently were, omitted as redundant. Hence, probably the shorter and less generally adopted reading.

vii. 53—viii. 11.

If the genuineness of this paragraph respecting the woman taken in adultery is to be decided by an appeal to documentary evidence, it cannot be maintained. That evidence, as it now stands, is clearly against the passage as a part of John's Gospel. Of all the Greek manuscripts that have come down to us from a date prior to the eighth century, the only one that contains the passage is D, which is noted "for its numberless and strange deviations from other authorities," especially for its "many bold and extensive interpolations."¹ The only ancient versions that contain the passage are the Old Latin manuscripts *b* first hand, *c*, *e*, *ff*², *g*, *j*, the margin of *l*, and the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions, to which may be added the later Slavonic, Anglo-Saxon, Persic, and Arabic Versions, which were obtained mainly or wholly through the Latin. Of the Greek Fathers, Euthymius, of the twelfth century, is the first to notice the passage as a part of John's Gospel. The "Apostolic Constitutions," of the third or fourth century, alludes to the story of a woman accused before the Lord of many sins ; so does Eusebius, following Papias ; but he did not consider it as a part of Scripture. Besides, the copies that contain the paragraph vary among themselves in their readings more than in any other part of the New Testament. All of which circumstances naturally lead one to conclude that the passage is not a proper part of the fourth Gospel. And yet, as Scrivener says, "while it is absent from too many excellent copies not to have been wanting in some of the very earliest, the arguments in its favor, internal even more than external, are so powerful, that we can scarcely be brought to think it an unauthorized appendage to the writings of one,

¹ Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 126.

who in another of his inspired books deprecated so solemnly the adding to or taking away from the blessed testimony he was commissioned to bear."¹ And one of the foremost of American New Testament scholars has well said, "Uniting the internal with the external difficulties, the numerous varieties of reading (always suspicious) and the absence of the passage from so many manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, the case is strong against it — only, however, against its genuineness *here*. That it is, if not Johannean, at least apostolic, and describes a real and most remarkable incident in the life of our Lord, cannot be well doubted; there is none in the record of our Saviour's life that is more completely lifted above any conception which belonged to the men of his time, and more completely beyond the probability of fabrication. In the Lord's answer to his accusers, by his ready escaping from the snares laid for him, and that subtle appeal to their consciences, which, by placing the lustful feeling on a virtual equality with the outward act (as Matt. v. 28 ff.), dissolved the accusation and dispersed the accusers; and in his subsequent treatment of the woman, his separating his mission, on the one hand, from human civil tribunals, and his assertion of his divine relation as not here to condemn and punish, but to pity and save, it proves itself worthy of a place — however it got there — in the heart of the most spiritual of the Gospels."² And Dean Burgon, in reference to this passage, says, "I am convinced that the first occasion of the omission of those memorable verses was the lectionary practice of the primitive Church, which, on Whitsunday, read from S. John vii. 37 to viii. 12, *leaving out the twelve verses* in question. Those verses, from the nature of the contents, as Augustine declares, easily came to be viewed with dislike or suspicion. The passage, however, is as old as the second century, for it is found in certain copies of the Old Latin. More-

¹ *Introduction*, p. 610.

² A. C. Kendrick, D.D., *Amer. Ed. of Meyer's Gospel of John*, pp. 294, 295.

over, Jerome deliberately gave it a place in the Vulgate."¹ This seems to be a very reasonable view, if not the real explanation, of the omission of the passage and of the various readings found in connection with it. We should be slow to have the passage stricken from the Bible.

viii. 38.

Rec. T. Ἐγώ, ὁ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ μου, λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν, ὁ ἑώρακατε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν, ποιεῖτε. — I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father.

Rev. T. ἄ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἤκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ποιεῖτε. — I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye also do the things which ye heard from *your* father.

The common reading, in retaining "my," is supported by **Σ**, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, the entire body of the cursives, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Clementine Vulgate, and some copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Tertullian; in retaining "your," it follows **Σ**, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and all the other witnesses that read "my Father." The Revisers' Reading, omitting *μου*, is attested by B, C, L, T, X, two manuscripts of the Old Latin, and seven of the Vulgate, the Roman Ethiopic, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria; and in omitting *ὑμῶν*, by B, L, T, 13, the Roman Ethiopic, Origen (who in both instances seeks to defend the omission), and Cyril of Alexandria. But there is an evident contrast between τῷ Πατρὶ and the following τῷ πατρὶ, or τοῦ πατρὸς of the Revised Text; and with this contrast existing, it is impossible that the Revisers' Text should present the true reading. Such a reading, in such a connection, moreover, forbids such a rendering as is given in the R. V.; though either

¹ *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, p. 219.

of these clauses standing by itself, uncontrasted with the other, might allow the Greek article to be represented in English by an unemphatic "my" or "your." But, as they stand, in connection with each other, and without the genitives ($\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\psi\mu\omega\nu$), the only proper rendering becomes that given in the margin, which makes "the Father" refer in both instances to God: "I speak the things which I have seen with the Father; do ye also therefore the things which ye heard from the Father"; or, the words might be rendered, "Of what I have seen with the Father, I speak; so, too, what ye have heard from the Father, ye do." But either of these—the only legitimate renderings of the Revisers' Text—is so unsatisfactory, so palpably inexpressive of Jesus' thought, that it condemns the text itself. The Jews evidently perceived that Jesus did not refer to God in what he said concerning him whose teachings they were said or enjoined to follow. They saw, too, that he referred to some other father than Abraham. Hence their reply. But this was owing to the Saviour's using the emphatic pronoun "your" in connection with "father," and in contrast with "my Father." The Revisers' rendering, while doubtless giving the Saviour's meaning, is not a legitimate translation of the Greek text which they have adopted. In omitting $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\psi\mu\omega\nu$, that text is plainly at fault.

viii. 39.

Rec. T. $\text{Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ποιεῖτε ἅν.}$

—If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

Rev. T. $\text{Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐστε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ποιεῖτε.}$

—If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

To this rendering, against the word "were" the Revisers affix the marginal note, "Gr. *are*"; that is, "If ye are Abraham's children" etc.—The received reading $\eta\tau\epsilon$ is attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , every cursive except one lectionary, seven copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito

Syriac, Origen three times (in each instance followed by the imperfect, $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$), Eusebius three times, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, and other Latin Fathers. (A is defective here.) The Revisers' reading $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ (which they found it necessary to abandon when they came to translate) is supported by $\aleph$, B, D, L, T, one lectionary, $\mathfrak{f}^2$ of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen ten times, it being followed in each instance by the imperative $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ (he having, without doubt, taken both these forms from a different manuscript from that from which he quoted the common reading in the three passages above referred to), and Augustine. As for the second verb, most of the witnesses give the imperfect, some with and some without $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. Codex B first hand, and, as just seen, $\mathfrak{f}^2$, the Vulgate, Origen, and Augustine give the verb in the present imperative. Now, it is this imperative form that points to the origin of the reading $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$, which is supported by every witnessing document that has the imperative instead of the imperfect. In some early copy, the augment of the verb seems to have been carelessly dropped, and the $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (which would naturally accompany $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, just as it accompanies $\eta\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$, "ye would love," in verse 42), became lost or absorbed in the following $\nu\upsilon\nu$, leaving $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ in place of $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. The manuscript that contained this reading, falling into the hands of some one else, was afterwards "corrected" by changing $\eta\tau\epsilon$ to $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$,—giving the plausible reading, "If ye *are* Abraham's children, *do* the works of Abraham." But the copyists of $\aleph$, D, L, and T, as well as an early corrector of B, or some of their predecessors, finding that the imperative of the second verb was unwarranted, replaced the imperfect $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, but retained $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$. Hence the Revisers' reading. The reading of the Received Text is placed beyond a doubt as to its genuineness by verse 42. There, precisely the same structure occurs as here; and it is fully attested as genuine. And, inasmuch as the proper grammatical structure is strictly adhered to there, we hazard nothing in saying that it is a moral impossibility for the

writer of verse 42 to have put words together as they appear in the Revisers' Text in the verse before us. Such composition is due only to others. If John were given to writing like this, the case would be different. But when he uniformly constructs his conditional sentences correctly, it becomes his critics to recognize this fact, and not to seek to fasten on him the errors of his copyists or others. — It may be added in passing, that the Revisers' Text, in Luke xvii. 6, presents a similar case of false reading, where the revised reading ἔχετε, "ye have," is simply an early attempt at improving the Saviour's statement, or possibly a transcriptional error for εἶχετε, "ye had." In either case, it is a false reading.

viii. 44.

There can be but little if any doubt on the part of competent witnesses that the common reading οὐχ ἔστηκεν, "standeth not," which is followed by the American Committee, is the true reading here. The English Revisers, however, have transferred this to the margin, and substituted instead the reading adopted by Westcott and Hort, οὐκ ἔστηκεν, "stood not." This last is apparently the reading of $\aleph$, B first hand, D, L, X, Δ , Λ second hand, and six cursives; while the former, which is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf (though he very inconsistently reads οὐκ ἔστηκεν), and other modern editors, is that of B third hand, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, T, Λ first hand, Π , and nearly all the cursives, — Λ being defective. ἔστηκεν is supposed to be the imperfect of στήκειν, "to stand." But this verb is nowhere found in the imperfect in classic Greek, or in the Septuagint; nor, apart from this passage, even in the New Testament; while ἔστηκεν appears everywhere. The latter is perfectly adapted to the context, it being in fact more in keeping with Christ's representation of Satan as the father of the truth-hating Jews to say that "he standeth not in the truth," i.e. his permanent attitude is against it, his character is that of

a liar, than to say that "he stood not in the truth," as if referring to some past act of his. The fact that so many ancient manuscripts unite in writing οὐκ, as if the next word began with a smooth breathing, is no evidence in itself against the perfect ἔστηκεν, "standeth." It only shows the carelessness or the false mode of pronunciation of certain scribes. Any one at all familiar with the old manuscripts need not be told that οὐκ occasionally appears where οὐχ properly belongs; as, οὐκ εὕρισκον (Mark xiv. 55), in B first hand, L, Δ ; οὐκ εὕρον (Luke xxiv. 3), and οὐκ ὑπάρχει (Acts iii. 6) in $\aleph$, C; οὐκ ὅτι (John vii. 22) in B first hand; and οὐκ ἔνεκεν (2 Cor. vii. 12) in $\aleph$, C, D, E, 17, etc. On the other hand, οὐχ sometimes usurps the place of οὐκ; as, οὐχ, ἰδοὺ (Acts ii. 7) in $\aleph$, D, E, 61; οὐχ ὁ λόγος (Acts xii. 18) in $\aleph$, A, and (xvii. 4) in B first hand, and (xix. 23) in $\aleph$, Λ , D; and even οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς (Gal. ii. 14) in $\aleph$ first hand, A, C, P, 17, 37; while $\aleph$ as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, B, D first hand, and a few cursives have οὐχί for οὐκ here, — apparently intended as a correction of οὐχ, as if the final iota had been overlooked or absorbed in the next word. If any one is disposed to think that the evangelist himself may have pronounced ἔστηκεν with the smooth breathing, and consequently actually wrote οὐκ instead of οὐχ, he ought perhaps, in self-consistency, to conclude that John meant to say, in iii. 36, οὐχ ὁψεται, because D, Δ , Λ , so represent him; in vi. 42, οὐχὶ οὗτος, because B, T give this as his language; in vii. 22, οὐκ ὅτι, because the copyist of B represents him as having so written instead of οὐχ ὅτι; in x. 28, οὐ μὴ ἀρπάσῃ, because $\aleph$, D, L, X, 71, 157, and a few other cursives read thus instead of οὐχ ἀρπάσει; in xvi. 7, οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ (as Westcott and Hort do), because B, L, and Chrysostom give us these as his words instead of οὐκ ἐλεύσεται; or in xix. 6, οὐκ εὕρισκω, because L, Δ say so.¹

¹ Those who desire a more complete examination of this passage are referred to the exhaustive essay of the late Prof. Ezra Abbot, to be found in his *Critical Essays* (pp. 286–293), published by Geo. H. Ellis, Boston, 1888.

ix. 4.

Rec. T. Ἐπεὶ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με — I must work the works of him that sent me.

Rev. T. ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με — We must work the works of him that sent me.

This is one of the worst of the spurious readings introduced into the Revisers' Text. It is attested only by B, D, and the Thebaic and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, — D, however, reading *δεῖ ἡμᾶς* etc., instead of *ἡμᾶς δεῖ* etc. It is, of course, adopted by Westcott and Hort, and is given as a primary reading by Tregelles. **§** first hand, L, the Memphitic, Roman Ethiopic, and Erpenius' Arabic Versions, and Cyril of Alexandria read, "We must work the works of him that sent us." This, Tischendorf thinks, could not have originated with a corrector of the text; hence he adopts it. And yet it is plainly a modification and attempted improvement of the other, — the apparent incongruity between "we" and "me" having naturally led to the change. The received reading, which is adhered to by Lachmann, Alford, and others, is attested by **§**'s contemporary corrector or "proof-reader," A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the entire body of the cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Platt's Ethiopic. That this is the original reading seems clear. Jesus had just met a blind man, to whom all was as night; and who, by his blindness, was disqualified for working. Yet no one was to blame for his condition. If viewed aright, his blindness was of God, in order that in his restoration to sight there might be a display of divine power. The announcement of this fact naturally draws the attention of the disciples to Jesus as about to make such a display. But, before making it, he goes on to say, "I" — with special emphasis upon the word, contrasting himself thereby with the Jews who were before him, and who were commanded not to work on that day, — "I must work the works of him that sent me

while it is day," — while the opportunity for working is presented, though it be the Sabbath. "The night" — the time of darkness, when the eyes must be closed in death to all earthly things — "cometh, when *no one* can work"; not only the blind, but all will be disabled from farther work. It is this reference to men in general, considered as a reason, though it is not formally stated as a reason, for the Saviour's making the preceding remark, that led some early reader of this Gospel, who failed to see the propriety of Jesus' saying that he, any more than others, should work while it was day, to change "I" to "we," — making the Saviour say, "We [*i.e.* we all, mankind in general] ought to work the works of him that sent me [*i.e.* of God] while it is day, [for] the night is coming, when *no one* can work." It is converted into a general admonition against being "weary in well doing," or sleeping away one's privileges and opportunities. It was by no means necessary to change "him that sent me" to "him that sent us." For the emendator's purpose, there was no fitness, no propriety in the latter wording, while the expression "him that sent me" was altogether suitable, it being Jesus' well-known form of speech for "God." The change to "us," adopted by Tischendorf, was obviously effected by a later hand. — Compare B's reading in xvii. 12, *ὅτε ἦμεν μετ' αὐτῶν* etc. "While *we were* with them, I kept them" etc.

ix. 6.

Rec. T. ἐπέχρισεν τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, — he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.

Rev. T. ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, — he anointed his eyes with the clay.

Neither this rendering of the Revisers, nor that given in the margin — "and with the clay thereof (he) anointed *his* eyes" — can be pronounced a correct rendering of the Revised Text. The expression, "the clay thereof," is an unmeaning phrase, — one that can be invested with sense only by inserting some

such word as "made," which cannot be done without reading ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Neither can αὐτοῦ be referred to the blind man, so as to be translated with ὀφθαλμούς "his eyes." Its position forbids this. The only legitimate rendering that this text admits is "He spread his clay upon the (his) eyes." The Jerusalem Syriac Version has it correctly, "He overlaid the eyes of the blind man with *his moistened earth*," or clay. "His," *i.e.* the mortar which *he* (Jesus) had made; not "its," or the mortar *of the spittle*. The only witnesses to this reading as a whole are **Σ**, L, 1, 33. Codex B differs from them by having ἐπέθηκεν, "placed," instead of ἐπέχρισεν, "smeared" or "spread." A, C second hand, four or five other cursives, and Cyril of Alexandria, like the foregoing documents, read αὐτοῦ; but, unlike them, these as well as C first hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, A, II, the rest of the cursives, a number of versions, including the Syriac, Chrysostom, and Ammonius of Alexandria also add τοῦ τυφλοῦ, "of the blind man," as the Received Text does. And this Lachmann accepts as the original reading. It is confirmed by D, which in its peculiar way reads αὐτῷ for αὐτοῦ, and αὐτοῦ in place of τοῦ τυφλοῦ. The Old Latin Version and the Vulgate also testify, by somewhat similar readings, to ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς τοῦ τυφλοῦ as the true text, — "He spread his moistened clay upon the eyes of the blind man." But αὐτοῦ, being misunderstood or considered superfluous, was afterwards dropped in some copies, while it led to the omission of τοῦ τυφλοῦ in a few in which the pronoun itself was retained.

X. 18.

The "ancient authorities," here referred to in the margin, that read, "No one *took* it (*i.e.* my life) away" in place of "No one *taketh* it away," are only **Σ** first hand, and B. The reading is an impossible one, resulting from carelessness in copying, the proper vowels having been mistaken for others, — an itacism of

not infrequent occurrence. Buttmann¹ speaks favorably of the reading; but it is certainly no gnomic or iterative aorist, as he seems to consider it. Westcott and Hort, of course, adopt the reading; but it is indefensible.

X. 22.

The margin here notes the fact that some ancient documents read "*At that time* was the feast" etc., instead of "*And* the feast was." Those documents are B, L, 33, and the Thebaic and Armenian Versions; while the Memphitic Version and one manuscript of the Latin Vulgate combine both readings, and say, "And at that time was" etc. On the other hand, nine or ten cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, and Chrysostom omit both, and begin the verse without any connective. The reading, "at that time," is a transparent gloss, designed to give definiteness to the statement. If it had been the original reading, the other would hardly have crept in, much less become so generally prevalent.

X. 22.

Rec. T. καὶ χειμὼν ἦν · — and it was winter.

Rev. T. χειμὼν ἦν · — it was winter.

The conjunction of the Received Text may have been absorbed in the first syllable of the next word, from some early copyist's misunderstanding what was dictated to him; or it may have been omitted by the same hand that changed δέ to τότε in the beginning of the verse, to give greater point and terseness to the passage: "At that time occurred the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem. It was winter, and Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon's porch." This, however, is not in accordance with John's running style: "Now the feast of the dedication was in progress at Jerusalem, and it was winter"; — the

¹ *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, American edition, pp. 202, 203.

latter clause being incidentally thrown in for the information of non-Jewish Christian readers. Otherwise the writer would have gone directly on, and said, "was in progress at Jerusalem; and Jesus was walking" etc. The conjunction is wanting in **Σ**, B, D, G, L, X, **Π**, four cursives, one manuscript of the Old Latin, the Ethiopic, and the two Egyptian Versions; while it appears in A, E, F, K, M, S, U, **Γ**, **Δ**, **Λ**, nearly all the cursives as well as manuscripts of the Old Latin (**δ** omits the whole clause), the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and in Chrysostom.

x. 29.

"That which my Father hath given unto me is greater than all" appears in the margin here as the reading of some ancient documents in place of "My Father who hath given them to me is greater than all." In other words, some ancient documents read **ὁ**, *quod*, and **μεῖζον**, *majus*, where most documents read **ὅς**, *qui*, and **μεῖζων**, *major*, in the sentence **ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέ μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστι**. The only Greek manuscript that reads **ὁ . . . μεῖζον** is the Vatican Codex as penned by its original scribe. His contemporary "proof-reader," however, changed the **ὁ** to **ὅς**, but left the other word unchanged, as the uncials A and X also read. The Sinaitic Codex and L, on the other hand, read **ὁ**, but have **μεῖζων**. All this shows that the transcribers of these manuscripts were at a loss about the text, and left it in obvious error; for neither **ὁ . . . μεῖζόν ἐστι** nor **ὅς . . . μεῖζόν ἐστι** is grammatical Greek or reasonably translatable. The Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic Version, and the Latin Fathers generally adopt the reading of B,—"quod mihi dedit majus est." But the Greek Fathers give no countenance to this reading. Cyril of Alexandria, in opposition to Tertullian's reading of the passage, quotes the common text as presenting John's words. Tischendorf says, it is incredible that any one who had found **ὅς** and

μεῖζων in the text should have deliberately changed them into **ὁ** and **μεῖζον**. We presume no one really supposes that the change was *deliberately* made. It shows for itself that it was not. The early readings **ὅς . . . μεῖζον** and **ὁ . . . μεῖζων** declare plainly that the former crept in through the very common mistake of writing an **ο** for an **ω** in **μεῖζων**, or else that the latter arose from the unconscious introduction of **ὁ** as the article, but without any breathing, in place of **ὅς** through the influence of the preceding **ὁ** still lingering on the copyist's mind. Either one of these blunders having been committed, a subsequent scribe detecting the inconsistency of coupling a neuter with a masculine word, and not perceiving in which the error lay, completed it by making both words neuter, instead of correcting it by changing the neuter back to the masculine. This is all there is of it; and the Vatican Codex is one of the places where just such errors appear. From the fact that B's "proof-reader" or reviser changed the **ὁ** to **ὅς** and left **μεῖζον** uncorrected, the probability is that in B's exemplar the error was in the latter, not in the former,—the reviser in making his correction simply "following copy."

x. 39.

Rec. T. **Ἐζήτουν οὖν πάλιν αὐτὸν πιάσαι**.—Therefore they sought again to take him.

Rev. T. **ἐζήτουν πάλιν αὐτὸν πιάσαι**.—They sought again to take him.

Οὖν is wanting in B, E, G, H, M, S, U, **Γ**, **Λ**, about forty cursives, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic Versions. D, the Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions read "And they sought" etc. But **Σ**, A, K, L, X, **Δ**, **Π**, most of the cursives, every manuscript but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom attest **οὖν** as the true reading. And this is one of the places where John, who employs the word so freely, would naturally, if not of necessity, use it. It was evidently dropped out

inadvertently because of its following ἐξήτουν, — the copyist not observing that the letters OYN needed to be repeated. After its omission from some manuscripts, καί was introduced, as in D, etc., under the conviction that *some* connective was necessary, and that that was the proper one.

xi. 44.

Rec. T. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς, — And he that was dead came forth.

Rev. T. ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς, — He that was dead came forth.

This omission of the conjunction is found in B, C first hand, L, one lectionary, one version (the Thebaic), and Origen once. The fact that Origen omits it is of but little weight. The want of connection between sentences embodying thoughts so closely united as these is not in favor of the omission. It misrepresents the evangelist's well-known style. Having recorded Christ's cry, "Lazarus, come forth!" he would naturally follow this up with saying, "*And* he that had been dead came forth." And so we must believe he actually did write, unless we reject the testimony of **Σ**, A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. It is true that D, *f* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Andreas of Crete insert εἰθύς, or εὐθέως, "immediately," in connection with καί; but this does not in the least reflect upon the genuineness of the conjunction. The omission belongs to the same class of readings as ἐκραξεν (in C) and ἐκραύασεν (in L) for ἐκραύγασεν, in the preceding verse, — false.

xi. 45.

Rec. T. θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν, — had seen the things which he did.

Rev. T. θεασάμενοι ὃ ἐποίησεν, — beheld that which he did.

The plural ἃ is set aside for the singular ὃ, with the marginal note that "many ancient authorities read *the things which he*

did." This "many" must be a misprint for "most"; for the "ancient authorities" referred to are **Σ**, A first hand, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives (three of them reading ὅσα instead of ἃ), every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen at least six times, and Andreas of Crete. The singular, which appears in the Revised Text, is the reading of only A second hand, B, C, D, three cursives, *e* of the Old Latin, the Thebaic, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, — C second or third hand adding σημεῖον, making the words read, "the miracle which." It is clearly a change from the plural to the singular suggested by the one act to which special reference is made. Had this been the original reading, it could hardly have been intentionally changed, much less become so general. The same change to the singular was attempted in the next verse, where it appears in C, D, M, two or three cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions. But the evangelist evidently wrote the same in both verses.

xi. 53.

Rec. T. συνεβουλεύσαντο — they took counsel together.

Rev. T. ἐβουλεύσαντο — they took counsel.

In support of the latter reading, we have the testimony of **Σ**, B, D, the lost uncial represented by 13, 69, 124, and 346, Origen in one passage, Athanasius, and Chrysostom; in support of the former, that of A, E, G, H, I, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives except Ferrar's group, Origen twice, the Paschal Chronicle, and Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril says explicitly that John "does not say that from that hour *they consulted* ἐβουλεύσαντο to commit the murder, but that *they consulted together* συνεβουλεύσαντο; that is, what seemed best to each individually was determined upon by all conjointly." While the weight of "authority" favors the common reading, it is noteworthy that this, and not the simple word, is the one used in the other instances (Matt. xxvi. 4, John xviii. 14), in which the chief

priests, scribes, and elders are spoken of as conspiring against Christ's life; and it is but natural that the evangelist should have used the same word to express the thought here. The circumstances seem to call for the compound form: they deliberated *one with another*, they "counselled together," in order to effect their purpose.

xi. 54.

Rec. T. *κακεὶ διέτριβε* — and there continued.

Rev. T. *κακεὶ ἔμεινε* — and there he tarried.

There seems to be no special difference between the meanings of these verbs. The latter is used by John about forty times, but the former only once elsewhere (iii. 22), — a circumstance which rather indicates its genuineness here, the other word looking as if it had been substituted instead, on account of John's known use of it elsewhere, as in i. 38, 39, ii. 12, iv. 40, x. 10, and xi. 6. The common reading, which is that adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by A, D, E, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and the Paschal Chronicle. The revised reading, which is preferred by Tregelles, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, is that of *Σ*, B, L, 249, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Origen three times. Indeed, the reading may have originated with Origen through his familiarity with John's vocabulary. However this may be, it was a current reading in his day.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. *Ἄφες αὐτήν · εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετήρηκεν αὐτό.* — Let her alone; against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

Rev. T. *Ἄφες αὐτήν ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό.* — Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying.

The received reading is supported by A, E, F, G, H, I, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, most of the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin,

the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Gothic. The revised is attested by *Σ*, B, D, K, L, Q, Π, 33, 42, 145, 157, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Jerusalem Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian and the Ethiopic. But the reading is demonstrably false, — having originated in a desire to attach a clearer and more natural meaning to Christ's words than they seemed to have. Jesus spoke of his burial in anticipation, speaking as if he was about to be, or was on the point of being, buried. And this he could do without violence to his words, inasmuch as he was laid away in the grave only four or five days afterwards. But some early reader of this Gospel, unable to see how Jesus could be anointed so long beforehand for his burial and while he was still alive and at a feast, considered the words irrelevant if not entirely out of place. To remove the supposed difficulty, he inserted *ἵνα*, "that," and changed the form of the verb correspondingly, from the perfect indicative to the aorist subjunctive, — making Jesus say, "Let her alone *that she may preserve it*" etc. This, of course, implies that the remark was made before the anointing was effected. It means, "Instead of asking or wishing her to sell the ointment, and to use the money for the poor, let her alone that she may keep it for the day of my burial, and use it then." But Judas's objection, to which the words of Jesus were a reply, was not made until *after* the woman had used the ointment. His words were not, "Why *may* (or *should*) not this ointment be sold?" but "Why *was* it not sold?" *i.e.* instead of being used as it has been. "The rendering, *Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying*, seems to have little pertinence against the murmuring of the thievish disciple (which was not directed against any supposed future use of the money, but only against its present alleged waste); nor [is it] very intelligible in itself, as that part of it which had been used *could* not be so preserved [*i.e.* on the assumption, and it is a mere assumption, that only a part of the ointment had been used], and of a

remaining portion of it the text says nothing.”¹ The alternative rendering found in the margin, “Let her alone: *it was* that she might keep it against the day of my burial,” is simply an attempt to make the best of a false reading,—an attempt for which there is no warrant elsewhere in the New Testament. That is to say, though *ἵνα* appears in the New Testament more than 650 times, nowhere else can a clause introduced by it be found that is dependent on a verb which is neither expressed nor necessarily implied in the context, as this marginal rendering supposes this clause to be,—unless it is in some such connection as we find it in 2 Cor. ix. 4, “we (*that* we say not ye).” In Mark v. 23, the supplied words, “I pray thee,” are fairly implied in the immediately preceding παρακαλεῖ, “beseecheth.” And in Mark xiv. 49, and two or three other similarly constructed passages, the words “it is,” or “ye did it not,” or something similar that might be inserted in a literal rendering, as, “But *this is* that the Scriptures might be fulfilled,” are clearly demanded not merely by the preceding statement, but by ἀλλά, “but,” which implies an unexpressed clause. Here, however, there is no such demand. The inserted words, “it was,” are intended to refer to the course the woman had pursued, and are equivalent to saying, “She did not sell it, and give the proceeds to the poor,—she used it as she has,—in order that she might keep it against the day of my burial”; which introduces in connection with the evangelist’s words an idea that not only is uncalled for by them, but cannot be coherently construed with them. The only consistent, self-evidently genuine reading here is that of the Received Text,—“Let her alone; for the day of my burial *hath* she *kept* this.”—Because the reading *ἵνα . . . τηρήσῃ* is found in the two oldest extant Greek manuscripts, it does not of necessity follow that it must be genuine. We *know* that these two documents are

¹ A. C. Kendrick, D.D., in Meyer’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, American edition, p. 383.

united again and again, and united with other documents, too, in presenting false readings. The mere fact that **Σ** and B were transcribed fifty years, more or less, earlier than A is in itself no proof whatever that they contain an earlier and necessarily purer text than the latter. There is reason in all things; in judging of textual readings, as well as in other things. A reading which presents palpable internal evidence of being spurious or depraved it will not do blindly to accept as genuine because it is found in a certain class of manuscripts, when it is opposed in a number of other documents of equally respectable character by a reading which reasonably appears to be genuine; and even forces itself upon our convictions as such.

xii. 23.

Rec. T. ἀπεκρίνατο — answered.

Rev. T. ἀποκρίνεται — answereth.

The latter reading is attested by **Σ**, B, L, X, 33; the former by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Ethiopic. That there should be a difference in reading here among the Greek manuscripts is not strange, especially as the two words in uncials might be easily mistaken by a careless scribe one for the other. But that *every one* of the ancient versions, some of which were made long before our oldest known Greek manuscripts were written, should give this verb in a *past* tense if the present is the true reading, is hardly credible.

xii. 25.

Rec. T. ἀπολέσει αὐτήν • — shall lose it.

Rev. T. ἀπολλύει αὐτήν • — loseth it.

It is hardly safe to trust to **Σ**, B, L, 33, and *ff*² of the Old Latin Version as giving us the original text here, when all the other

documents, including not only Greek manuscripts, but versions, and the Fathers as far as we have their testimony, declare in favor of the other reading. When it comes to the translating of a tense which there is no special reason for changing to another tense in translating, and we invariably find that tense rendered by a future in the languages into which it is translated, the unavoidable and just conclusion is that the tense in the originals from which those versions were made must have been a future. The present, "loseth it," of the Revised Text, found in only four Greek manuscripts, is clearly the result of ignorance or inattention on the part of some early scribe, under the influence of the preceding present, "He that *loveth* his life." The same alteration was evidently wrought, in some one or more lost manuscripts, on the word φυλάξει, "shall keep," in the latter part of the verse; for several copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Nonnus, and even Origen there have the present, φυλάσσει, *custodit*, "keepeth," though it is not known to exist in any extant Greek manuscript of the New Testament. The true reading here, beyond question, is ἀπολέσει, "shall lose," which the Revisers have rejected. It is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, every cursive but one, every copy but one of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, and all the other ancient versions, as well as some of the Fathers, Greek and Latin. If we needed any farther proof of the genuineness of this reading, we might find it in the parallel passages, in which Christ is invariably reported as having employed the future, "shall keep." It is so even in Matt. x. 39, where it is preceded as here by a present, — "He that findeth." Critics who, in instances like this, pronounce a reading spurious on account of its identity or similarity with a parallel reading, adopt mere conjecture, not argument, in proof of their position. The existence of the future here in all the versions cannot be accounted for by saying that it was introduced from the parallel passages. Christ's words may be expected to be given by all his reporters in language more or less identical.

xiii. 18.

Rec. T. Ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον — He that eateth bread with me.
 Rev. T. Ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον — He that eateth my bread.

The Revisers seem to have strained a point in their margin in translating the common reading, "He that eateth his bread with me." If this had been the meaning of the evangelist, he would probably have inserted αὐτοῦ, "his," after ἄρτον, just as he inserted it after πτέρναν immediately following, in order to express "his heel." The literal rendering of the Greek is, "He that eateth *the loaf* with me"; *i.e.* as the A. V. has it, "He that eateth bread with me," or is a table-companion, a familiar friend of mine. But let that pass. The common reading, which is followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by **Σ**, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, and the Armenian Version, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom twice, Cyril of Alexandria in giving the text, and Theodoret. The reading of the Revisers is that of B, C, L, three cursives, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Ethiopic Version, Origen three times, Eusebius, and Cyril in commenting on the verse. It is an evident attempt at conforming the evangelist's words to those of the Septuagint in Psa. xl. 10 (xli. 9), ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου. The other is unquestionably the genuine reading.

xiii. 22.

Rec. T. Ἐβλεπον οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, — Then the disciples looked one on another.

Rev. T. ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, — The disciples looked one on another.

Οὖν is wanting in **Σ** as changed by its earlier seventh-century emendator, B, C, three cursives of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, *ε* of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. Origen, in one place, inserts δέ instead; but, two pages further on, he quotes the verse without δέ or οὖν. Quoting it, however,

as he does, it is but natural that he should omit the conjunction, which was not at all necessary to his purpose, but rather in his way. This passage is one of those in which John, whose use of connectives is one of the striking features of his style, and who employed *οὐν* more freely and frequently than any other New-Testament writer, would most naturally have used it. It is, in fact, improbable that he could have written the verse without it. The word may easily have dropped out, in transcribing, on account of its resemblance to the preceding syllable. Its presence is well attested by *Σ* first hand, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, all but two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Cyril. A few cursives and versions, like Origen in one instance, insert *δέ* instead.

xiii. 23.

Rec. T. Ἦν δὲ ἀνακείμενος — Now there was leaning.

Rev. T. ἦν ἀνακείμενος — There was at the table reclining.

The conjunction is wanting in B, C first hand, L, four cursives of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and Origen twice. It is found in *Σ*, A, C second hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the rest of the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin (a few of them and the Vulgate having "therefore"), the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and Cyril. Its use is perfectly Johannean; and most editors consider it genuine.

xiii. 24.

Rec. T. πυνθῆσθαι τίς αὐ ἐπὶ περὶ οὗ λέγει. — that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake.

Rev. T. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Εἰπέ τίς ἐστι περὶ οὗ λέγει. — and saith unto him, Tell us who it is of whom he speaketh.

In support of the common reading, we have A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, *c* of the Old

Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Cyril of Alexandria. The revised reading is that of B, C, I, L, X, 33, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions. Origen also has this reading in two or more places. There are a number of variations, however, among the documents. The Sinaitic Codex combines the two readings, adding the revised after giving the received. The Vulgate and several manuscripts of the Old Latin, instead of "and *saith* unto him," have "and *said* unto him." Two Old Latin versions and Origen omit "unto him." Five copies of the Old Latin have "Ask (him)" instead of "Tell (us)"; while another of these Old Latin manuscripts as well as the Vulgate and Origen omit both "Ask" and "Tell." Another copy of the Old Latin and the Ethiopic Version omit "who it is." In a word, the revised reading is attended with so many variations that it is fairly suspicious. But this is not all. It might be asked, If Peter *spoke* to John, why should he also have beckoned to him, as if John was too far away for him to say to him what he wanted to say? We are neither told nor allowed to infer that he beckoned to him simply to gain his attention. If, from the distance at which he must have been from John to make it necessary to beckon to him, he spoke loud enough for John to hear him, why should he not have addressed his inquiry directly to Jesus, who of course must have heard whatever he might have said to John, inasmuch as the latter was leaning on Jesus' breast. And again, what propriety was there in Peter's saying *to John*, "Tell us who it is" etc.? for Peter cannot be supposed to have thought that John knew whom Jesus meant any more than himself. The revised reading, however, which is evidently an attempt to enliven the discourse by introducing the form of direct address, seems to have originated in the idea of some early reader that Peter supposed that the Saviour must have told John who it was to whom he referred; whereas the very circumstances mentioned — the sad and troubled state of Jesus' mind, and

the doubting, questioning look of the disciples themselves — show that there was nothing of this kind. There is no reason whatever for supposing that John had received any confidential disclosure of the secret. The idea that Peter could have entertained any such thought is wholly foreign to the conditions of the narrative. The very fact of Peter's "beckoning" to John is enough to show that he intimated by a gesture what he was not willing to express in words, — namely, his desire that John, because of his nearness to Jesus, would ask him who it was. If Peter were represented, as some of the Old Latin versions represent him, as having said to John, "*Ask him who it is,*" there might be some show of propriety in it. But this is not the reading. On the whole, the revised reading, with its more or less conflicting witnesses and its obvious points of questionableness, has every appearance of being a fabrication. On the other hand, the common reading, sustained by the generally concurrent testimony of its witnesses (only D, as might be expected of this manuscript, reading "who *this one* might be," and the Memphitic Version, otherwise concurring with the others, omitting "who it might be"), commends itself as presenting every reasonable indication of genuineness. Compare note on Mark x. 49.

xiii. 32.

Rec. T. Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ, — If God be glorified in him.

Rev. T. Omits.

This clause is found in **Σ** as corrected by its earlier seventh-century emendator, A, C as changed by its sixth-century reviser, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, A, most of the cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, most manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, Münster's Thebaic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the printed Ethiopic. Origen gives it twice, Cyril and Nonnus each once, and Hilary four times. It is wanting in **Σ** first hand, B, C first hand, D,

I., X, II, twelve or more cursives, several copies of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, in the Philoxenian Syriac, some manuscripts of the Ethiopic, and in Ambrose. But the clause would not have found its way into the text, if it were not genuine. It may have been dropped as superfluous; but it is more probable that it was unconsciously omitted by some copyist on account of its likeness to the preceding clause, the copyist supposing that he had transcribed it, when he had given only what preceded.

xiii. 32.

Rec. T. δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, — shall glorify him in himself.

Rev. T. δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, — shall glorify him in himself.

Though the Revisers set aside the common reading in the Greek, it will be observed that they find it necessary to follow it in translating. In support of the received reading, we have **Σ** as corrected by its earlier seventh-century reviser, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, II, nearly all the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and other versions, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Tertullian. The revised is supported by **Σ** first hand, and again as changed by its later seventh-century emendator, B, H, A, a few cursives, and Origen twice. But it must be borne in mind that the old manuscripts, in which the breathings and accents are generally omitted, often give αὐτον as their spelling of ἑαυτοῦ. Thus in John ii. 24, **Σ** first hand, A first hand, B, L, give αὐτον (Westcott and Hort, αὐτόν) for ἑαυτόν; in viii. 22, D first hand, Γ, A, a few cursives, and Origen read αὐτον for ἑαυτόν; in xx. 10, **Σ** first hand, B, L, have αὐτους (Westcott and Hort, αὐτούς) instead of ἑαυτούς; and so in many other places. But it cannot be supposed that these forms are intended always to denote the simple personal pronoun of the third person. In many cases, they are plainly used as the syncopated form of the reflexive, as Westcott and Hort present this form here, — αὐτῷ.

xiv. 4.

Rec. T. Καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδατε. — And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.

Rev. T. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν. — And whither I go, ye know the way.

The latter reading is that of **Σ**, B, C first hand, L, Q, X, a few cursives, *a* of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and the Persic of Walton's Polyglot. The former is the text presented by A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin with the exception of a single manuscript, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The difference between these readings cannot be regarded as due to accident. Nothing short of a deliberate purpose could have effected the change, whichever way it was made. The two oldest extant manuscripts have the shorter reading; and, if these were trustworthy, we should be compelled to accept it as the genuine reading. By looking forward, however, into verse 5, where the same hand has evidently been at work, we find that B, C first hand, *a*, and the Ethiopic Version, omitting the connective "and," read πῶς οἴδαμεν τὴν ὁδόν, "How know we the way?" while D, *δ*, *ε*, *μ*, and Tertullian, some of them retaining "and," others omitting it, read πῶς τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδαμεν, where the Received Text has καὶ πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι; "and how can we know the way?" This last reading is supported by **Σ** (except that it places δυνάμεθα after ὁδόν), A, C second hand, E, G, H, K, L (omitting καί), M, N, Q, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, the entire body of the cursives, all but four manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the three Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Gothic, and Chrysostom. That is to say, most of the supporters of the shorter reading in verse 4 (or **Σ**, L, Q, X, all the cursives, and the Memphitic Version), are found parting company with their allies, and uniting in verse 5 with the supporters of the longer and commonly

accepted reading. They throw their testimony in the latter verse against the supporters of the shorter reading, which the Revisers have also adopted there. In verse 4 they unite with them in the abrupt, artificial, un-Christlike utterance, "And whither I go — ye know the way" thither. But, in verse 5, after saying, "We know not whither thou goest," they cannot sanction the unnatural curtailment of Thomas's words, "How know we the way?" This language speaks for itself that it is the work of some lover of cold, epigrammatic phraseology, not the utterance of an unlettered, bewildered, anxious disciple, who would naturally say, "*and how is it possible for us to know the way?*" The simple, twofold reply of Thomas in verse 5, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest, *AND* how can we know the way?" shows plainly enough that Christ's words in verse 4 must have been, "*Both* whither I go ye know, *and* the way ye know." But some early reader of the Gospel, thinking he could improve upon this, cut it down to suit himself. And the result of his revising, which robs the Saviour's words of their heart and gracious fulness of meaning, must be accepted as a part of the genuine text!

xiv. 7.

Rec. T. ἐγνώκετε ἂν · — ye should have known.

Rev. T. ἂν ᾗδετε · — ye would have known.

The change here seems to have been wholly unnecessary to a revision of the English text. In fact, if the Revisers had followed their Greek, they would have made strange work with the English. The rejected reading is attested by A, C third hand, P second hand, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursives, Athanasius, Pseudo-Athanasius twice according to the codices, and Chrysostom. The revised reading is that of B, C first hand, Q (and, if εἰδῆτε, the perfect subjunctive, can be considered the same reading, of L and X also), four cursives, Basil, and Cyril. But this is an inherently improbable reading. It is a pluperfect in form, but it has the signification generally of

an imperfect or preterite. In John viii. 19, it appears twice, and is to be translated as an imperfect: "If ye *knew* (ᾔδατε) me, ye *would know* (ᾔδατε ἄν) my Father also." So in general where it appears as genuine.¹ Here, therefore, to be consistent, we need to translate the word, "If ye had known me, ye *would know* (not *would have known*) my Father also." The common text represents Jesus as using the same word in both protasis and apodosis. This was Jesus' usual way of speaking. But some one, evidently desirous of introducing variety into his language, changed it to a word which, though in the pluperfect, John never employs except as an imperfect. The only safe course here is to adhere, as Lachmann and others do, to the accepted reading, — especially so, if the end sought is only a revision of the English New Testament.

xiv. 14.

Rec. T. Ἐάν τι αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, — If ye shall ask anything in my name.

Rev. T. ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, — If ye shall ask me anything in my name.

The American Committee of Revisers here very properly follow the Received Text, but add the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities add *me*." This received reading is attested by A, D, G, K, L, M, Q, S, A second hand (the original scribe, by a common oversight, having omitted this verse together with the last clause of the previous verse), II, most of the cursives, four manuscripts of the Old Latin, one of the Syriac Version, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Cyril. The revised is vouched for by **Σ**, B, E, H, U, F, Δ, thirty or more cursives, two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and Usan's Armenian Version, — the

¹ The only exceptions to this are in Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39, and Rom. vii. 7.

last of these omitting "in my name." In verse 13, as well as in xv. 7 and xvi. 26, Jesus presents the same thought without saying "shall ask *me*." Yet, in verse 13, four cursives insert "me," while others, as here, insert "the Father." All these readings are mere additions, intended to determine to whom the request should be presented, — a point which Jesus himself makes perfectly clear in xv. 16 and xvi. 23. The critical hand that inserted "me" here was perhaps led to this by the repetition of αἰτήσητε, "ye shall ask," in connection with the emphatic ἐγὼ ποιήσω, "I will do it."

xv. 11.

Rec. T. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μένῃ, — that my joy might remain in you.

Rev. T. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ᾖ, — that my joy may be in you.

The former is the reading of **Σ**, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X; F, Δ, A, II, most of the cursives, *f* of the Old Latin, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The latter is that of A, B, D, ten cursives, the Old Latin with the exception of one manuscript, the Vulgate, the three Syriac Versions, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The Greek manuscripts greatly preponderate in favor of the former; but the versions, in favor of the latter. In the most ancient manuscripts *ι* was often written *ει* (and *vice versa*), as we still find it in later ones. Thus ὑμῖν appears in D, at Mark xi. 29, xiii. 37, etc., for ὑμῖν; μικρότερος in the same Codex at Luke vii. 28, for μικρότερος; γεινομένης in A and B, at John xxi. 4, for γινομένης; and, not to refer to numberless other instances, the familiar forms Δαυίδ, Πιλάτος, Χωραζίν or Χωραζίν appear in very many manuscripts as Δαυείδ, Πιλάτος, and Χωραζείν or Χωραζείν. Now the ὑμῖν in this clause was undoubtedly written in early manuscripts ὑμῖν. But, in copying the words YM€INME€INH, some transcriber inadvertently overlooked and omitted the second ME€IN, and the two words became reduced to YM€INH, afterwards ὑμῖν ᾖ. Hence

the few Greek manuscripts and the various versions with this reading. The fewness of Greek manuscripts in support of ἡ is not the only thing, however, that naturally awakens suspicion. It is the unusual combination of uncials, — A, B, D. Besides this, the sense which yields is tame in comparison with that thrown into the words by μέν. The very context indicates that the Saviour said what he did to his disciples, not so much that his own joy might simply be infused into them and *be* in them, as that it might *continue* in them, so that, as he added, their joy *might be made to abound*. The idea of his joy abiding as a permanent joy in them is what he seems to have intended to express; and this calls for the common reading.

xvi. 4.

Rec. T. ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα, μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν, — that when the time shall come, ye may remember . . . them.

Rev. T. ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν, μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν, — that when their hour is come, ye may remember them.

There is much confusion here among the manuscripts. In some, αὐτῶν stands both before and after μνημονεύητε; in some, only before; in some, only after; and in still others it is entirely wanting. We believe with Tischendorf that the original reading is that of the Received Text, which is attested by $\aleph$, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Y, Γ , Δ , Λ , most of the cursives, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, Chrysostom, and Cyril, — giving αὐτῶν as the object of μνημονεύητε, and placing it where it should be, after the governing verb. But some early critical reader, desirous of making it clear *what* hour the Saviour meant, inserted the word αὐτῶν after ὥρα, thereby converting “the hour” into “their hour,” as a brief way of saying “the hour for remembering what he had told them.” Hence the Revisers’ reading, which is found in A, B, Π as originally written, four cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions. Others, as the lost

uncial represented by Ferrar’s group, L, Π second hand, five cursives, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Augustine, and Cyprian twice, retaining the pronoun after ὥρα, reject the other as unnecessary, and read “that, when their hour shall come, ye may remember that I told you [of them].” Finally, Π , one cursive, α of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version omit the pronoun as superfluous in both places, and read “that, when the hour shall come, ye may remember that I told you [of them].” This glance at the origin of the different readings clearly indicates the common reading to be the genuine one.

xvi. 23.

Rec. T. ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃτε τὸν Πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, δώσει ὑμῖν.
— Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

Rev. T. ἂν τι αἰτήσῃτε τὸν πατέρα, δώσει ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου.
— If ye shall ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name.

While the Revisers adopt the reading followed by Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort in the latter part of this passage, Griesbach and Lachmann still hold to the common reading as presenting the original text. But this would hardly be the case if the testimony were overwhelmingly against the received reading. In support of it are A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ , Λ , Π , the whole body of the cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom twice, and Cyril once. The revised is supported by $\aleph$, B, C first hand, L, X, Y, Δ , Münster’s Fragments of the Thebaic Version, Origen twice, and Cyril once, on a different occasion. It will be seen from the foregoing, that all the ancient versions, except Münster’s Fragments of the Thebaic, have the common reading. This rather indicates that, while the new reading was known in Origen’s day, — the middle of the third century, — it did not exist in those earlier exemplars from which the oldest of the old versions, to say nothing of the

rest, must have been taken. These versions *all* agree in reading, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name." Is it possible that the sources from which they were derived could, every one of them, have been corrupt, and been corrupted exactly alike? The collocation of words given in the Revised Text has every appearance of being the result of a pious desire to fix the supposed true meaning of the passage, effected, apparently, about the close of the second century. It is one of those well-intended efforts which appear in certain ancient manuscripts, but which are blindly received by too many as the veritable work of the Holy Spirit. We can almost see the poor man at work over his manuscript. He finds Christ saying, "In that day, of ME ye will ask *nothing*." He goes on, and thinks he finds him saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Whatsoever* ye shall ask THE FATHER,—in my name he will give it you!" To make this, which is not a bad meaning, and which he piously believes to be the true meaning, clear to others,—to fix it so that it shall not be misunderstood!—he finds nothing necessary but to transpose two words. He neither adds to, nor takes from, the text; he simply places δώσει ὑμῖν, "he will give you," *before* instead of *after* the other words, so that the meaning, formerly ambiguous, may in future be perfectly transparent: "He will give it you in my name!" Does any one say, he might have done this at xv. 16? There is no such occasion for transposing the words there as here. And in xiv. 13, 14, there is no possibility of making the transposition. Verse 24 shows Jesus' meaning, and confirms the common reading. It shows that the contrast is between asking *Christ* for something, and asking *the Father in Christ's name*: "In that day ye shall ask ME nothing; but whatsoever ye shall ask *the FATHER in my name*, he will give you. *Hitherto* ye have asked *nothing in my name*; ask, and ye shall receive." If the revised reading, "He will give it you in my name," were correct, the next verse would need to read, "Hitherto have ye *received* nothing in my name." But the reading, "Hitherto

have ye *asked* nothing in my name," which could not truthfully be changed, while irrelevant as connected with the Revisers' previous reading, is in perfect harmony with the original wording. It harmonizes, also, with all Christ's utterances in this Gospel in regard to his disciples' asking in his name. The only act that it is said the Father will do in Jesus' name is the sending of the Comforter, xiv. 26; and this, not in answer to his people's prayer, but in answer to his own; xiv. 16. This uniformity of expression in Christ's use of words to present the same thought, as we have before observed, is one of the evidences not only that the language so given is his, but that the record containing it is genuine, while another would be disposed to introduce some change in the phraseology.

xvii. 3.

The Revisers here had an opportunity to do really needed work in correcting a false reading. But they allowed it to pass unimproved. The text, both received and revised, reads, "And this is life eternal, that they might (or should) know [ἵνα γινώσκωσι] thee" etc. In other words, the verse begins as if it was intended to be a definition of the eternal life to which reference is made at the close of the previous verse, but ends with the declaration of a purpose,—“that they might (or should) know” etc. The trouble lies in the form of the Greek verb, which the text gives in the subjunctive. Instead of this, the true reading is γινώσκουσιν, the indicative, “they know.” This is attested by A, D, G, L, Y, Δ, Λ, the cursives 33, 244, and the lectionary 222. The other reading may be an itacism; but, more probably, the transcriber who introduced it was led into the error under the idea that the indicative present should never follow ἵνα,—and, once introduced, it was naturally accepted. But the construction of ἵνα with the indicative is unquestioned in 1 Cor. iv. 6, “that ye *be* not *puffed up*,” or “not to be puffed up.” Also in Gal. iv. 17,

and possibly elsewhere. And when we consider that "John is much less rigorous than others in his employment of the particle *ἵνα*, and its original telic force is often obscured by him,"¹ while internal probability demands the indicative, and the external attestation is so emphatic in its favor, we can hardly err in the conclusion that the indicative, not the subjunctive, is the original reading here. With this, the language is consistent throughout: "And this is life eternal, to know [*ἵνα γινώσκουσιν*, literally 'that they know'] thee" etc. Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, Davidson, and others adopt this as the true reading.

xvii. 4.

Rec. T. τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα — I have finished the work.

Rev. T. τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας — having accomplished the work.

The substitution, as here, of a participle in place of a personal verb, and sometimes, as in verse 1, in place of a verb and a conjunction following, a change which generally makes no real difference in the signification, is as a rule a step of more or less doubtful propriety. The whole context generally — certainly here — shows the participle to be an intruder, the work of a pedant striving to improve the language, to break up the sameness of the style, and to introduce a variety of expression unfamiliar to the evangelist. And when these readings, though vouched for by what are generally considered the best manuscripts, are opposed by a large and respectable, though perhaps not an overwhelming body of other witnesses, it ought to be regarded, in connection with the evidence from internal probability, as decisive proof of their spurious character.

¹ Buttmann, *Gram. of New Test. Greek*, p. 235, American edition.

xvii. 11, 12.

Rec. T. τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι · — keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me. ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου · οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐφύλαξα, — I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept.

Rev. T. τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, — keep them in thy name which thou hast given me. ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι · καὶ ἐφύλαξα, — I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me: and I guarded them.

The received reading, in verse 11, is attested by D second hand, 69, a few cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Epiphanius twice; in verse 12, by A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, Y, F, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Origen. The revised reading, in verse 11, is supported by **Σ**, A, B, C, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, Y, F, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursives, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, Athanasius, and Cyril, — and seemingly by D first hand, U, X, and ten or twelve cursives, which read *ὁ* instead of *ᾧ*. In verse 12, *ᾧ* is supported by B, C first hand, L, 33, 64, and Cyril three times, — and *ὁ* by the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ** (the original transcriber having omitted the clause), the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and the Armenian Version. It will be observed that the testimony in support of *ᾧ* in verse 12 is far less weighty than in verse 11. It will also be observed that the attestation of *οὓς* in verse 11 is very feeble, but not so in verse 12. In view of this, Dr. Broadus says, "How [shall we] explain the fact that so very many authorities have *whom* here [in verse 12], and *which* in the immediately preceding and exactly similar sentence? Are not the phenomena best accounted for by supposing that in verse 12 the Saviour's language returns to the expression of verses 6 and 9, and that so the true reading is *which* in verse 11, and *whom* in verse

12?"¹ We think not. Jesus was not in the habit of changing his language in this manner. When he did express himself differently after having once uttered a thought, there was a reason for it other than the mere seeking of a varied diction. In verse 2, his words are $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\iota}$, "all that thou hast given him." Note the words; not merely the singular relative, but the singular antecedent $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, which calls for a relative in the singular. Just so in vi. 37, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \psi\ \delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota$, and in vi. 39, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$, though the reference, in all these instances, is to those whom the Father had given him. But in verse 6 of this chapter Christ's words are $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, "to the *men* whom thou hast given"; and in verse 9 [$\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\iota}\nu\ .\ .\ .$] $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \omega\acute{\nu}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, "for *those* whom thou hast given." So, too, in xviii. 9, $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\iota}\nu$, "of *those* whom thou hast given me." In all these instances, the relative is plural, because its antecedents are in the plural. In these two verses (11, 12), however, this consistency in Jesus' language as reported by the evangelist is marred. Some early blundering critic, wishing to bring the language of this clause into conformity with that in verse 2, and not considering that the plural antecedent $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ would be a standing protest against his work, changed $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to δ . Hence the reading of D first hand, U, X, etc. But others, not being able to refer δ to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and mistaking its intended reference, instead of changing it back to $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, as D second hand really did, regarded it as an erroneous transcription of ψ , referring it to $\delta\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, "name," and accordingly gave it this form. This change was wrought in verse 11 at an evidently early date. Hence the appearance of this reading in so many manuscripts and versions. But was not the reading in verse 12 made at the same time? It seems at first sight that, if made at all, it must have been made then. One would hardly be expected to change a reading in one verse, and for no apparent cause leave the same reading un-

¹ Note, p. 343 of American Commentary, Gospel of John.

changed in the next verse. But the critic, instead of changing the word in verse 12, cut the knot by omitting the entire clause in which the word appears, as we actually find it omitted in the Sinaitic Codex, which reads, "I kept them in thy name; I guarded them," etc. Copyists who transcribed from this and like manuscripts, in supplying from other sources the omitted words, would be likely to obtain a correct reading. All transcripts from exemplars thus prepared would then contain ψ in verse 11, and $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in verse 12. This will easily account for the inequality of the evidence in support of ψ in the two verses. Whatever may be said in favor of the reading, "Keep them in *thy name which thou hast given me*," this language is neither clear nor like any other utterance of Christ's. The expression, "thy name," as used in verse 6, as every intelligent Bible reader ought to know, is only an oriental synonym of "thee," as "his name" is a synonym of "him," and "my name" of "me." In 1 Cor. x. 2, the apostle Paul expresses himself according to English idiom: "and were all baptized [professedly bound] unto Moses." But elsewhere, as in 1 Cor. i. 13, 15, he employs the oriental form of speech: "Were ye baptized in [or rather unto] *the name of* Paul?" and "in [unto] my name?" instead of "Were ye baptized unto Paul?" and "unto me?" In like manner, the words "baptizing in [unto] the name of the Father," etc., in plain English mean "baptizing unto the Father," etc. Just so, to believe on or in one's name is to believe on or in the one named. To believe, for example, in the name of the Lord is to believe in the Lord. To glorify God's name is to glorify God. To manifest or make known God's name to men is to manifest God, to make him known to men. The lame man at Jerusalem (Acts iv. 10) was healed in or by "the name of Jesus Christ," or, as is immediately added, "even in" or "by him." It was through power received from Jesus. In Acts iv. 12 we read that there is "none other name," *i.e.* no other one, by whom we must be saved. Any attempt to attach an intelligible scriptural meaning to the words "thy name which

thou hast given me" must prove a failure; for the reading is obviously a spurious one. Christ's prayer was that the Father would keep his followers in union with himself, and not suffer them to become apostates.

xvii. 21.

Rec. T. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν· — that they also may be one in us.

Rev. T. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν· — that they also may be in us.

The Received Text here is overwhelmingly supported by **Σ**, A, C third hand, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, three manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Clement of Alexandria, Origen again and again, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Cyprian, Hilary, and others. The revised reading is that of B, C first hand, D, four copies of the Old Latin, the Thebaic and Armenian Versions, and possibly three or four of the Fathers. But C first hand is untrustworthy here, for it omits *ἐν* in the beginning of the verse also, making it read, "That all may be as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be in us." Even Origen's testimony, in the one place where he omits *ἐν*, is not in favor of this reading. It is, *ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἐν ἑσμεν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν*, "As thou and I are one, that they also may be [*i.e.* may be one] in us." These words, however, are not properly a quotation of Jesus' language. Not only is the documentary testimony emphatic in support of the common reading, but the internal evidence is also. The very point of the Saviour's prayer lies in the word that has been omitted from the Revisers' text. In verse 20, Christ is represented as saying, "I pray not for these only, but for them also who believe on me through their word." And what was his prayer? "That they all may be ONE, even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be one *in us*;" *i.e.*

not only united, as he had just prayed they might be, but united "in us." The word *ἐν* is necessary to give pertinence to the accompanying expression "in us." Omit the word "one," and the prayer becomes simply a prayer that "those who believe on him," and who are therefore "in him," may be *in him and the Father!* The words are completely emptied of their meaning. And yet the reading must be accepted as genuine, because haply some careless transcriber omitted *ἐν* from among the several similar syllables of which it is one, and his omission crept into *three* manuscripts and six or seven ancient versions that have come down to us!

xvii. 24.

Rec. T. οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα . . . κάκεινοι ὥσι μετ' ἐμοῦ· — I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me.

Rev. T. ὁ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα . . . κάκεινοι ὥσι μετ' ἐμοῦ· — that which thou hast given me, I will that . . . they also may be with me.

The received reading is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Clement, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Cyprian, and others. The revised is that of **Σ**, B, D, the Memphitic and Gothic Versions, and a manuscript of the Vulgate to which Lachmann seems to have had access. Yet Lachmann rejects the reading; and rightly, for it is a companion of the false readings found in verses 11, 12. It testifies against itself; for the relative, instead of having an antecedent in the singular as at verse 2, is accompanied by an antecedent in the plural, — *ἐκεῖνοι*, "they," or "those"; and we may rest assured, at least, until we have better evidence to the contrary than we now have, that John never wrote, and that Jesus never uttered such Greek as *ἐκεῖνοι ὅ*, "those (or they) which." See Note on verses 11, 12.

xix. 7.

Rec. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, — by our law he ought to die.

Rev. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, — by that law he ought to die.

The presence of ἡμῶν, "our," here is attested by A (C and G are defective), E, H, K, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Π, all the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The omission is found in Σ, B, L, Δ, all manuscripts but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen three times, and, as might be expected, in Hilary and Augustine, as well as in D's text as restored after the ninth century in certain mutilated portions, of which this from John xviii. 14 to xx. 13 is one. Ημῶν was probably regarded as superfluous by some early critical scribe; or it may have dropped out, as words often do, in transcribing. Hence its omission in a certain class of documents. And, if the word were not emphatic, its absence would be by no means unusual or strange. Compare verse 26. But some qualifying word like "our" law, "that" law, or the law "to which we refer," is really essential here. This the Revisers saw. Hence they translated, "and by that law." Their text, however, reads "and by *the* law," or "according to the law." It would be just as proper to translate τὸν νόμον here, "our law," as "that law." But neither is really proper; for, whether we say "our" or "that," the word is emphatic, and not legitimately represented in Greek by the article. That there is no probability that the evangelist wrote the verse without ἡμῶν is apparent from the fact that he begins it with an emphatic "we": "We have a law"; and, to carry out the idea thus introduced, this emphatic "we" needs to be followed by "our,"—"and according to *our* law," that is, as distinguished from your Roman code, "he ought to die." And the weight of documentary

evidence really preponderates in favor, and in confirmation, of this reading. Compare Revised Text of Luke ii. 51.

xx. 18.

Rec. T. ὅτι ἑώρακε τὸν Κύριον, — that she had seen the Lord.

Rev. T. ὅτι ἑώρακα τὸν Κύριον, — I have seen the Lord.

The received reading is supported by A, D, E, G, I, K, L, M, U, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, five manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, and the Armenian, as well as by Cyril and Severianus. "I have seen" is the reading of Σ, B, X, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, and the Ethiopic; while S, and 33 read, "We have seen." In addition to this, two of the three Old Latin manuscripts that support the Revisers' reading, the Vulgate and the Thebaic Version also read, "and he said these things *to me*," instead of "to her"; while the Memphitic reads, "and these are the things that he said to me"; and the Ethiopic and a few others close the verse with the words, "and what things he said to her she recounted," or, "she recounted to them." And, if their readings are false here, what assurance have we that they are not at the beginning of the sentence? These various readings, certainly, very naturally awaken suspicion as to the genuineness of the remaining peculiar variation which these documents support. They indicate, as already suggested, that the form of direct address originated in a transcriptional blunder, in writing ἑώρακα for ἑώρακε. But this reading being harsh and not generally acceptable, the last few words became more or less modified, — some documents returning to the original text as found in other copies, and others giving the words a still different turn. Whatever may have been its origin, however, the revised reading is plainly not in harmony with John's manner of narrating events. On the other hand, it is perfectly in accord with his usual mode of writing, to say, "Mary the Magdalene cometh,

announcing to the disciples that *she* had seen the Lord, and he had said thus and so *to her*." — Compare Note on Mark x. 49.

xxi. 23.

Rec. T. καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, — yet Jesus said not.

Rev. T. οὐκ εἶπεν δὲ . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, — yet Jesus said not.

The common text, which Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others follow, is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The revised reading is that of **Σ**, B, C, 33, and apparently that followed by *ε* of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and Schwartz's Memphitic, while Wilkins' Memphitic is without a conjunction. Origen, Cyril, and Chrysostom also support the revised reading. But, if this had been the original reading, the other could hardly have crept in. It looks as if δέ was introduced to give a more pronounced adversative character to the conjunction than καί was supposed to have. John, however, often uses the latter as equivalent to δέ. For the purpose of revising the English version, the change was wholly unnecessary, even if δέ could be considered the evangelist's word.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

i. 19.

Rec. T. τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν — in their proper tongue.

Rev. T. τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν — in their language.

The Revisers have omitted "own" or "proper" on the testimony of three manuscripts, — **Σ**, B first hand, D. But the Received Text is supported by A, B third hand, C, E, all the cursives but two (which read "Judean" instead), and by Eusebius and Chrysostom. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and most other modern editors accept the word as genuine. It is one that Luke uses elsewhere (ii. 6, 8) in the same connection, — though D, alone of all the Greek manuscripts, in one of these instances rejects it, — and employs it to denote the dialect *peculiar* to the speakers and hearers referred to. He means not merely their language in a general way, but their own language, — in this instance the very idiom of the inhabitants. The word is really emphatic, though it seems to have been omitted in two or three copies, as it is afterwards in one of these very manuscripts, as unnecessary. While Tregelles gives it a secondary place, Westcott and Hort, as far as we know, are the only editors, aside from the Revisers, who reject it as spurious.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. ἦσαν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. — they were all with one accord in one place.

Rev. T. ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. — they were all together in one place.

The common reading ὁμοθυμαδόν is vouched for by C third hand, E, most of the cursives, the manuscripts of Athanasius'

writings, as well as by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Augustine in his treatise against the Manicheans. The revised $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is supported by $\aleph$, A, B, C first hand, two cursives (18 and 61, the last of which is considered by some, because of its general resemblance to B, the most important of the cursive manuscripts of the Acts), ϵ of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Augustine in two other places. D and the two Egyptian Versions omit the word as superfluous. And, indeed, $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is superfluous. No one of us would think of writing or saying, "They were all in company together," or "in the same place together," which are the literal renderings and only meanings of the Revisers' Greek. No more ought we to suppose that Luke could have written thus. And we must be convinced of this, when we consider two or three facts. The first is that $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is a word that Luke nowhere uses, — unless here, in this needless, superfluous way.¹ On the other hand, $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδόν$, "with one accord," is a word that Luke employs at least eleven times in this treatise. It expresses just the idea that he would naturally wish to express here; for all know that in those days there was a wonderful unanimity and harmony of action among the disciples. Then the expression $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$, "in one place," which occurs several times elsewhere is each time rendered "together."² The only apparent reason why it is not so translated here is the palpable

¹ John is the only one of all the New-Testament writers who employs $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$; — twice in the sense of in company (iv. 36, xx. 4), and once as meaning in the same place (xxi. 2). The word primarily and properly has a *local* reference. It is nowhere used in Greek as meaning "together," in the sense of being in concert, in harmony or agreement. Yet it may have crept into the text here under the impression that such was the case; though we are inclined to doubt it. The word does not seem to have been introduced intentionally.

² At Acts iii. 1, the Revisers have taken this expression, and, connecting it with the last verse of chapter ii., translated it "to them," — a rendering which it does not admit, and for which, if that had been the writer's meaning, he would undoubtedly have written $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, as in chapters v. 14 and xi. 24 he wrote $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \text{Κυρίῳ}$, "to the Lord."

absurdity of the rendering, "They were all together together," which is partially hidden under the words "together in one place." It looks as if some early transcriber's mind had been preoccupied with the *idea* embodied in $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$, which lay just before him, and half-confused with a lingering impression concerning the *form* of the proper word to be written, unconsciously allowed that impression to control his pen and cause him to write $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ instead of $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδόν$. Mistakes of like character not only appear elsewhere among the manuscripts, but are made again and again even in our day, and sometimes by the most careful copyists.¹ As we are confident that no English writer would put words together thus, we are the more ready to believe that Luke's words were perverted in some such way as this, whoever may apparently testify to the contrary. Indeed, when we consider how excellent a writer of Greek Luke was, and how he expresses himself elsewhere, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that he wrote in this absurd manner.

¹ If the reader considers this explanation unsatisfactory, and still holds that the manuscripts that support the Revisers' reading must present the original text, let him look at the following, and see what he thinks of the correctness of some of those manuscripts: — In Acts i. 14, the original scribe of the Sinaitic Codex wrote $\etaσαν\ \delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδόν\ \pi\rho\sigmaκαρτεροῦντες\ \delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδόν$, *i.e.* They all "were with one accord continuing with one accord" in prayer. And this lay uncorrected till the seventh century. In i. 18, Codex A, Gaudentius and Theophylact omit $\piάντα$, reading "and — his bowels gushed out." In ii. 9, A has "Cappadocia," while C has "Pappadocia," for "Cappadocia." In ii. 17, B, the Thebaic and Ethiopic Versions, and Cyril of Jerusalem read $\muετὰ\ ταῦτα$, "After these things," in accordance with the Septuagint, instead of Peter's words "In the last days"; while C and one cursive combine the two, and read, "After these things, in the last days." In viii. 6, D reads $-οντο$ (the letters preceding $οντο$ being obliterated) $καὶ\ ἐνέζοντο$ instead of $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδόν$, which can mean only that they did something "and washed"; — or, to give D's reading of the whole verse, "And when they heard of it all, the multitudes gave heed to the words spoken by Philip," and did something "and washed themselves ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$?) on hearing him and seeing the miracles that he wrought." — But enough of this.

ii. 47.

Rec. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετίθει . . . καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. — the Lord added to the church daily.

Rev. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετίθει . . . καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. — the Lord added to them day by day.

Here, it will be seen, the Revisers have omitted "to the church," and in its place substituted the first three words of the next chapter. But ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, as every reader of Greek must know, means, not "to them," but as the margin has it, "together,"—at the same time, unitedly. This reading is vouched for by **S**, A, B, C, G, 61, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and by Cyril of Alexandria, and Lucifer. D reads ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, then begins the next chapter with Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις Πέτρος, etc. That is, we will suppose, "The Lord *at the same time* was adding daily such as were saved *in* the church,"—possibly, "to the church"; then goes on, "Now *in those days* Peter and John," etc. The Received Text is attested by E, P, nearly all the cursives, and the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. Though this lacks the support of the oldest known manuscripts, it is loudly called for by the oldest of the versions and the intrinsic evidence of the readings. The Revised Text seems to have originated in a misapprehension of the true construction. This early led to the connecting of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό with this verse, instead of leaving it to be construed with the verse following. Taken thus, the clause was made to mean, "And the Lord *at the same time* was adding to the church daily such as were saved,"—a meaning not at all incongruous or improbable, considered in itself. Then, in order to fix this as the real meaning of the evangelist, the two phrases, "to the church" and "at the same time" were made to change places. This accounts for the order in which these words stand in Codex D, with the preposition ἐν, "in," between the two. But some critic or copyist, afterwards finding that in verse 41 there

is no church spoken of, to which the additions were made, or in which the work was going on, and considering that the reading here ought in this respect to correspond with that, omitted "to the church," or "in the church," as superfluous or unmeaning. Hence the reading adopted by the Revisers.

- The true reading, however, has been preserved in documents, which, though mainly of later date than some of the others, contain what is evidently an older text, and the genuine text. The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, seemingly out of place here, if not essential to a full expression of the writer's meaning in the next verse, is in perfect accord with the statement there made, and its emphatic position at the head of the sentence indicates its importance there as directing special attention to the fact that the apostles went together and worked together, two and two, as the Saviour had taught them to do.

iii. 6.

Rec. T. ἔγειραι καὶ περιπάτει. — rise up and walk.

Rev. T. περιπάτει. — walk.

The Revisers' Text, omitting the two words "arise and," is in accordance with **S**, B, D, and the Thebaic Version. The other represents the reading found in A, C, E, G, P, all the cursives, one manuscript (Hort's *h*) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Basil the Great, Basil of Seleucia, Chrysostom, Severianus, Theodoret, Euthérius of Tyana, Cyprian, Lucifer, Epiphanius, Didymus, and others. The words "arise and" are rejected on the testimony of four witnesses elsewhere found united in presenting false readings,—it being inferred that the words were introduced from Matt. ix. 5, or Mark ii. 9, or Luke v. 23, or John v. 8. But, as the man was a cripple, in a sitting posture (verse 10), nothing was more natural than that Peter should say to him, "Arise and walk," especially as Peter at the same time took

him by the hand, and helped him up. On the other hand, nothing could well be more unnatural than to say to one who was reclining, as this man probably was, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk." The man was *not in a position* to walk. It is far easier to believe that for some unknown reason the words translated "rise up and" were omitted than that they were not written there by Luke, especially when we see the array of witnesses in their support (some of which extend centuries farther back than the oldest known witnesses to the contrary), and are expressly told by the writer of the narrative that Peter, after telling him to rise, "took him by the hand, and *raised him up*."

iv. 1.

The reading "chief priests," to which the marginal note refers as found in some ancient documents in place of "priests," is attested by B, C, the cursive 4, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions. There is no probability of its being the correct reading, though Westcott and Hort, in accordance with their principles, admit it as such into their text. The priests referred to were those Levites then on duty in the temple as guards, whose business it was to preserve order under the command of "the captain of the temple," who was also a priest. The chief priests had nothing to do with this part of the temple service, and probably were not present at the time the affair spoken of occurred. The word "chief-priests" seems to have been ignorantly introduced from verse 6 or 23, to give the appearance of greater authority to the transaction. The reading of the text is abundantly supported by $\aleph$, A, D, E, P, 61, and the rest of the cursives, three copies (*d*, *e*, and Hort's *h*) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the two Egyptian Versions, as well as Lucifer and Chrysostom.

iv. 25.

Rec. T. δ διὰ στόματος Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου εἰπών, — Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said.

Rev. T. δ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου στόματος Δαβὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπών, — who by the Holy Ghost, *by* the mouth of our father David thy servant, didst say.

In a marginal note, the reader is told that "the Greek text in this clause is somewhat uncertain." The revised reading, while felt to be incorrect, was adopted apparently in sheer desperation, simply because of what was considered its superior attestation. It is the reading of $\aleph$, A, B, E, a few cursives, and Athanasius. (C is defective.) But it is certainly "a conflate reading," as Dr. Hort would call it; made by combining one or more other readings with the original. The received reading, though attested only by P, the cursives generally, and by Chrysostom and Theophylact, is apparently the original reading. That it is what Luke wrote, we have no doubt. But some very early reader, having in mind Acts i. 16 and ii. 29 (or Mark xii. 36 and xi. 10), wrote in the margin of his copy, as explanatory notes, the words διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, "by the Holy Spirit," and τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, "our father"; and some one else, into whose hands this copy passed, afterwards embodied these notes in a certain way in the text, while others in their copies embodied them in other ways. This accounts for the different and variously arranged readings that appear in the old manuscripts and other documents, some of which we append: Codex D reads, "who by (δ s διὰ) the Holy Spirit, *speaking by* (λαλήσας διὰ) the mouth of David thy servant, hast said." Didymus, like Codex D, omits "our father," and reads "who by the Holy Spirit *and* the mouth of David thy servant didst say." With this, the Peshito Syriac and Memphitic Versions closely correspond: "Who hast said by the Holy Spirit *in* the mouth of David thy servant." The Vulgate gives the full reading: "Who, *by* the Holy Spirit *through* the mouth of our father David thy

servant, hast said." So, too, with variations greater or less, read the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian Version, as well as Irenæus, Lucifer, and the author of *De Vocatione Gentium*. Hilary and Augustine, while retaining "our father," omit "by the Holy Spirit." The fact that there are so many variations—omissions, additions, and transpositions—in the longer reading adopted by the Revisers is in itself ground of reasonable suspicion. This is admitted on all hands. That this is the true explanation of the origin of this aggregated reading, there can be no question. That Luke himself wrote this clause as it stands in the Revised Text, is incredible. And to adopt it as if it came from his pen is an act of flagrant injustice to him, as well as a wrong to his readers. We must not forget that the old copyists of the New Testament writings were very far from being infallible.

V. 16.

Rec. T. συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ πόλεων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,
— There came also a multitude *out* of the cities round about unto Jerusalem.

Rev. T. συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ πόλεων Ἱερουσαλήμ,
— And there also came together the multitude from the cities round about Jerusalem.

The preposition "unto" is retained by D, E, P, nearly all the cursives, the Demidovian codex of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and Chrysostom. It is omitted by **Σ**, A, B, 103, 575, some copies of the Vulgate, the Ethiopic, the two Syriac and two Egyptian Versions, and Lucifer. The arrangement of the words τῶν περὶ πόλεων forbids the taking of περὶ as a preposition governing Ἱερουσαλήμ. It can be legitimately construed only as an adverb used adjectively, and meaning, "the *surrounding* cities." This necessitates the use of εἰς, or some other preposition before Ἱερουσαλήμ, making the whole clause read, "And the populace also of the surrounding cities (or,

of the cities around) came together *unto* Jerusalem." The omission of εἰς was the natural result of losing sight of the true construction, and considering περὶ as a preposition, as the Revisers have done. If Luke's meaning had been "of (or from) the cities round about Jerusalem," he would doubtless have written τῶν πόλεων περὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ; but, if he wrote τῶν περὶ πόλεων Ἱερουσαλήμ, his only meaning could be, "of the surrounding cities of Jerusalem." But this is a transparently false reading.

V. 28.

Rec. T. Οὐ παραγγέλια παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν—Did not we straitly command you?

Rev. T. Παραγγέλια παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν—We straitly charged you.

The received reading here is supported by **Σ** as corrected by its earlier seventh-century emendator, the Greek text of Codex D, E, P, all the cursives, both Syriac Versions, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Athanasius and Cyril each in one place, Basil the Great, Theodoret, and Chrysostom twice. The revised reading is that of **Σ** first hand, A, B, the Latin Version of Codex D, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Athanasius and Cyril each in another place, and Lucifer. After "asked" in verse 27, one naturally looks for a question. Hence, certain critics say, οὐ was inserted, and the sentence transformed into a question: "Did we not straitly charge you?" But, really, οὐ was more probably stricken out than inserted. And it was on this wise: An early reader, remembering that the apostles were positively charged (iv. 18), on the preceding day, not to teach in the name of Jesus, considered it absurd that this clause should read interrogatively, and holding that the last clause of the verse is the proper place for the question, struck out the οὐ, making the verse read, "We straitly charged you not to teach in this name; and lo! ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching; and do ye intend to bring upon us this man's blood?" After which, the narrative goes on naturally, "And

Peter and the apostles *answering*, said," etc. But to leave the verse, as the Revisers do, without any question in it, is probably more than the early corrector of the text intended. Yet to transfer the question to the end of the verse is unnatural, and inconsistent with the language of the record itself; for verse 29 shows that the apostles' answer was not to the last but to the first clause of verse 28. The received reading undoubtedly presents the original text, as the documentary testimony warrants us in believing. It is the stronger way of putting the statement, and just the way in which it was likely to be put, considering the circumstances in which the parties were placed.

V. 33.

Rec. T. ἐβουλευόντο — took counsel.

Rev. T. ἐβούλοντο — were minded.

The common reading is supported by **Σ**, D, H, P, most of the cursives, the Latin Version of E, the Vulgate, the two Syriac Versions, and Lucifer. The other is that of A, B, E, about fifteen cursives, the two Egyptian, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions, and Chrysostom twice. But the writing of ἐβούλοντο for ἐβουλευόντο was an error of frequent occurrence among ancient scribes; and this error seems to have been committed here. Not only is the Revisers' a feebler word than the other, but it fails to meet the apparent requirements of the context. Ἐβουλευόντο, on the other hand, expresses all that ἐβούλοντο does; and, by informing the reader that the Jews "proceeded to take counsel" (which is the import of the imperfect here), it also prepares him for the statement of the next verse: "There stood up one in the council," or Sanhedrim, etc. The context shows that they not only wished or were minded to slay the apostles, but proceeded at once to take measures to execute, if possible, their wish. This calls for ἐβουλευόντο; and there need be no question that this is what the author of the Acts wrote. Tischendorf, Alford, and others adopt it as the genuine reading.

V. 39.

Rec. T. οὐ δύνασθε καταλῦσαι αὐτό· — ye cannot overthrow it.

Rev. T. οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλῦσαι αὐτούς· — ye will not be able to overthrow them.

The present, δύνασθε, of the Received Text is attested by A, H, P, most of the cursives, one copy of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. The Revisers' future is found in **Σ**, B, C, D, E, about thirty-five cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. It seems to be a part of the false reading preserved to us in a few early manuscripts, which, by carrying the thought into the future, called for a change from the present to the future of this verb: "Ye *will* not *be able* to overthrow it [or them], neither ye, nor kings, nor tyrants," as D reads; or, as it is in E and a Greek manuscript to which the Saxon Bede had access, "Ye will not be able to overthrow it, neither ye nor your rulers." This future, too, is seemingly favored by the last word of the preceding verse, — "it will be overthrown." This would naturally lead a person who was changing the text to substitute the future for the present here. Without the additional expressions found in D, E, etc., the present is the stronger and more probably genuine reading. — As to the last word, whether we should read αὐτό or αὐτούς, there also seems to be a question. The common reading is that of C first hand, H, P, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Demidovian manuscript, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, Chrysostom twice, and Theophylact in both commentaries. Origen, quoting from memory, or paraphrasing, has instead, "the instruction of this one." The revised reading is that of **Σ**, A, B, C second hand, D, E, less than fifteen cursives, a catena, two copies of the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The connection, however, does not favor it. Gamaliel

had just said, "If this counsel or this work be of men, *it* will be overthrown; but if *it* is of God," — referring to the counsel or work just mentioned, not to the men under arrest, he necessarily went on to say, — "ye cannot overthrow *it*." Gamaliel could scarcely have positively affirmed of the apostles, "Ye cannot overthrow *them*": for they could easily have been taken aside and put to death. But, of any divine purpose or work, he could say, without fear of contradiction, "ye cannot overthrow *it*." Besides, the end sought was not the punishment or overthrow of the disciples, except as a means to something else. That end was the overthrow of the new religion, — which Gamaliel seems clearly to have thought might be a divine institution; and it was to this that his words evidently had reference. But some early emendator, finding him saying in verse 38, "Refrain from *these men*, and let *them* alone," thought that Gamaliel must have referred to the men here. Accordingly, to correct the text, as he supposed, he changed *αὐτό* to *αὐτούς*. In view of the other spurious readings that are preserved in D, E, and other manuscripts in this and the preceding verse, one may be prepared to believe that even this strongly attested reading, *αὐτούς*, which is plainly out of harmony with the context, is also spurious.

vi. 13.

Rec. T. οὐ παύεται ῥήματα βλάσφημα λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου. — ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place.

Rev. T. οὐ παύεται ῥήματα λαλῶν κατὰ κ.τ.λ. — ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place.

The revised reading may have the stronger external evidence in its favor, it being attested by **Σ**, A, B, C, D, six cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the two Egyptian Versions, while the other is supported by E, H, P, all the other cursives, a Latin lectionary of the eleventh century, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions only. But no one of *us*,

in speaking of others, would be likely to say that they "spoke words" against us. What else could they speak? We should either omit "words," or else insert some qualifying term, as "hard" or "lying" or something similar. No more ought we to believe that Luke wrote "He ceaseth not to *speak words*" against this holy place." This is not in accordance with his manner of expressing himself. In verse 11, where the same utterance is recorded, the speakers are represented as saying, "We have heard him speak *blasphemous words* against Moses" etc. And so, no doubt, it was recorded here. It is very easy to say, however, that the word "blasphemous" was introduced from verse 11. That it really was thus introduced, there is no evidence whatever. On the other hand, it is intrinsically improbable that the expression "to speak words" against a person or thing proceeded from so careful and finished a writer as Luke. Some early transcriber, in all probability, carelessly omitted the word, and the error was left uncorrected. But his blunder should not be accepted as presenting the original text, any more than other blunders, though transcribed into other manuscripts, and even translated into a number of other tongues.

vii. 7.

The old reading here, *δουλεύσωσι*, "they may be in bondage," is far more strongly supported by the documents than *δουλεύσουσι*, "they shall be in bondage." Yet the latter, which is intrinsically the true reading, is very properly adopted by Tischendorf, the Revisers, and Westcott and Hort, — **Σ**, B, and other documents to the contrary notwithstanding.

vii. 36.

Rec. T. ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου, — in the land of Egypt.

Rev. T. ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, — in Egypt.

The former of these readings is supported by the Greek text of Codex D, the greater part of the cursives, a corrector of the

Latin version *e* of Codex E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and Theophylact; the latter, by B, C, four cursives, a catena or commentary, the Latin version *d* of Codex D, and the Thebaic Version, while four other cursives read simply *ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ*. But probably no one of these is the original reading. *Αἴγυπτος* is a word which occurs in the New Testament twenty-five times, — in the Acts fifteen times; but never, either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint, is it properly accompanied by the article. The only instance now occurring to us in which the article accompanies it in the Septuagint is in Isa. xix. 18, where we read *ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ* in Van Ess's edition. But this is a misprint or a clerical error for *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*. It is true, also, that in Acts vii. 11 Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers, read *ὅλην τὴν Αἴγυπτον*, "all Egypt." But this, though supported by *Σ*, A, B, C, and 81, is unquestionably a clerical error, which originated in writing T for Γ, or τὴν for γῇ, and *Αἴγυπτον* for *Αἰγύπτου*, — the original reading there being *ὅλην γῇν Αἰγύπτου*. Compare the Septuagint at Gen. xli. 19, 46. *Γῇ Αἴγυπτος*, *γῆς Αἰγύπτου*, and *γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ* are all legitimate expressions; but not *γῇν Αἴγυπτον*, nor yet *τὴν Αἴγυπτον*. — In the verse before us, the true reading is plainly *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*, as Tischendorf reads, following *Σ*, A, E, H, P, 61, and nearly fifty other cursives, the first hand of the Latin Version of Codex E, and Chrysostom. This, too, is probably the correct reading in Acts xiii. 17, given by C, D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, and followed by Tischendorf, — a form occurring again and again in the Septuagint.¹ *Σ*, A, B, and less than twenty cursives, however, here (xiii. 17) read *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου*, — which is adopted by Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers.

¹ See Gen. xlvii. 11, 27, 28; Ex. xii. 29; xiii. 15; xvi. 3; xxii. 21; xxiii. 9; Lev. xix. 34; Numb. xiv. 2; Deut. x. 19; Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 12; Jer. xliv. 26, 27, 28.

viii. 18.

The ancient documents to which the marginal note refers as omitting the word "Holy" from the clause "the Holy Ghost was given," are *Σ*, B, the Thebaic Version, and the Apostolic Constitutions. The two words *τὸ ἅγιον*, could not have been accidentally lost; nor could their presence, if they were not already in the text, have been considered such a necessity as to tempt any one to insert them. The expression was apparently omitted on account of the occurrence of *ἅγιον* in the preceding as well as the following verse, by which a reader or scribe was very easily led to think the retention of the word here unnecessary, and its removal a decided improvement. Its presence as a part of the text is attested by all the other uncials (including A, C, D, L) and versions, and by all the cursives, besides Basil the Great, Chrysostom in two different places, John Damascene, and others.

viii. 37.

This verse is omitted by the Revisers, with the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities insert wholly or in part, verse 37, *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*" This passage, though quoted by Irenæus in both Greek and Latin, and known to Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine and others, is not found in any extant Greek manuscript earlier than the seventh century. It is wanting in *Σ*, A, B, C (D is defective here), H, L, P, more than eighty cursives, some copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, and the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Ethiopic, and in Chrysostom's and Theophylact's notices of the context. Besides this, the documents that have the verse differ considerably in their readings, — a circumstance that always awakens a suspicion of spuriousness. Though perfectly in harmony with the context, it seems as if it can

hardly be accepted as genuine. And yet, if it is an interpolation, it is as old as the second century at least. We should be slow to pronounce it positively spurious.

ix. 25.

Rec. T. λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί — Then the disciples took him.
Rev. T. λαβόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ — but his disciples took him.

The received reading here is supported by E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. The revised is the reading of **N**, A, B, C, F^a, 61 first hand, four manuscripts of the Latin Version, and Origen. But this, in all probability, is a false reading. As Bede says, Paul could not as yet be said to have made disciples; and, if he had, they would not be his, but Christ's; nor can Luke be supposed to have spoken of them as Paul's disciples. Nor, on the other hand, can the word "his" here by any law of speech be referred to Christ. It is simply a copyist's blunder in writing ΑΥΤΟΥ, "his," for ΑΥΤΟΝ, "him," the object of the participle λαβόντες. The fact that this form appears in a few of the earliest extant manuscripts, a few copies of one version, and a single passage in Origen, instead of proving its genuineness, only confirms the view that it is an erroneous reading, which, on that very account, met with but limited acceptance. The disciples referred to were obviously those at Damascus.

x. 3.

Rec. T. ὥσπερ ὥραν ἐνάτην — about the ninth hour.
Rev. T. ὥσπερ περὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην — as it were about the ninth hour.

The Received Text is the reading of L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic Version. The Revised is that of **N**, A, B, C (D is defective

here), E, twenty-five cursives, a catena, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Irenæus, and John Damascene. The word ὥσπερ, Luke uses at least fifteen times; in ten of which he uses it in connection with numerals, and once with words denoting a measure of space. In each of these eleven instances (*i.e.* of uses with numerals), unless this is an exception, he employs the word in the sense of "about," or "nearly." If the Revisers' reading here is correct, he uses it in the sense of "as it were," — denoting a sort of resemblance to something else, or an implied denial of just what is otherwise said in connection with the word. Thus, we read, in ii. 3, of "cloven tongues *resembling* fire"; and in ix. 18, that "there fell from his eyes something *like* scales"; and again, in Luke xxii. 44, that "his sweat became *as it were* great drops of blood." But why should Luke have said "as it were about the ninth hour"? Did he mean to say that the vision did not really occur about the ninth hour? No one among *us* surely would be expected to say, "You may look for me to-morrow, as it were about noon." The word "about" covers the entire ground. That certainly is Luke's *usus loquendi* elsewhere. If, however, we will only allow for a moment that ancient manuscripts are not necessarily infallible, but may even be united in error, as every textual critic knows they are again and again, the difficulty is not far to be sought. Some early reader, like some modern ones, had a notion of his own about Luke's meaning; but, finding that Luke's words here were not sufficient to support him in his interpretation, he went to verse 9, and imported thence the preposition περὶ, "about." This enabled him to give to the clause the meaning he thought he had found in it, or, more properly speaking, thought he had ensured to it, but which the Revisers have ignored; namely, "He saw in a vision, *as it were openly* (distinctly, with the naked eye), about the ninth hour," etc. The only thing that seems to have stood in the way of making his meaning obvious to others was the position of the words. But while the reading

was accepted by some, and possibly in the sense in which it was thus meant, others, who probably had earlier exemplars to follow, have transmitted to us the genuine text as generally received. If Luke had used the word *ὥσεί* in the sense of "as it were," he would assuredly have inserted it before *φανερῶς*, not after it. That he meant to say, "as it were about the ninth hour," is really too much for even the most credulous reader to believe.

X. 11.

Rec. T. *τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον, καὶ καθιέμενον*—knit at the four corners, and let down.

Rev. T. *τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιέμενον*—let down by four corners.

The fuller reading is that of C first hand, L, P, 61, and nearly all the other cursives, a catena, the Latin Version *d* of Codex D (which is defective here), the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, the Apostolic Constitutions, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The shorter reading is that of *Σ*, A, B, C second hand, E, four cursives, the Vulgate, the Ethiopic, Origen in four different places,—though he may have quoted from memory, and as much from chapter xi. 5 as from this verse,—Cyril, and Theodoret. But this reading, found in the three oldest extant Greek manuscripts, is probably the result of a comparison with xi. 5, and a desire to make it correspond with that. It is impossible to account for the presence, in this connection, of the omitted words, if they are not genuine, especially as there is nothing like them in the account given in the next chapter.

X. 24.

The reading "he entered," referred to in the marginal note, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, instead of "they entered," is that of B, D, 61, and two other cursives, the Vulgate, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, and Theophylact.

The common reading, "they entered," is attested by *Σ*, A, C, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. If Luke's thoughts at the time were taken up with Peter, as the chief one of whom he was speaking, he *may* have written "he entered." But the probability is against this; for his having just made mention of others in company with Peter makes it exceedingly probable that he wrote "they entered,"—especially as he immediately follows it with the remark that "Cornelius was waiting for *them*." The error, whether in writing the singular for the plural or the converse, might very easily have been effected through want of due care on the part of a scribe in mistaking an O for an E, or *vice versa*, leading him to write the singular for the plural, or the contrary.

X. 30.

Rec. T. *Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων, καὶ τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος*—Four days ago, I was fasting until this hour, and at the ninth hour I prayed.

Rev. T. *Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην τὴν ἐννάτην προσευχόμενος*—Four days ago, until this hour, I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer.

The Received Text here is supported by A second hand, D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Thebaic, and Chrysostom. The revised reading is that of *Σ*, A first hand, B, C, 61, and three other cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The mention of fasting here, as well as of praying, is an important circumstance, intended to show how Cornelius had been engaged. Some suppose that its omission may be explained by the fact that no fasting is spoken of in verse 3. This is possible. But it seems due rather to a misunderstanding of the preceding words, which some early reader probably took to mean, that on the fourth day previous, only from early

morning until about three o'clock, Cornelius had been without eating. This was thought to render *νηστεύων*, "fasting," unmeaning. Hence its omission as well as that of the following conjunction, leaving the remaining words to indicate that Peter, who set out in the morning, did not reach Cornelius' house till some time *after* three o'clock the next day: "I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer," said Cornelius; *i.e.* I was observing the three o'clock prayer service "until this hour,"—which, of course, makes it some time after three. But Cornelius' men, who started after three P.M. for Joppa four days before, were at Peter's door within twenty-four hours. The reading, however, is somewhat disjointed, as the Revised Version shows. But restore the omitted words, and all becomes coherent and clear: "Four days ago, I was engaged in fasting [He may have *begun* to fast the previous day; but on that day he says, I was fasting] until this hour, when [in addition to fasting] I was observing the ninth hour of prayer in my house; and lo!" etc. This makes Peter and his companions only a little longer on the way to Cornelius than the others had been in going to Joppa.

xi. 12.

Rec. T. *μηδὲν διακρινόμενον*—nothing doubting.
 Rev. T. *μηδὲν διακρίναντα*—making no distinction.

The former reading is supported by H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius. The latter is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, A, B, 61, and five other cursives; while, instead of this, *Σ* first hand, E, and four or five cursives have the *present* participle *διακρίνοντα*. D and the Philoxenian Syriac Version omit the words. The variation in reading between A, B and *Σ*, E naturally awakens suspicion respecting the active participle. In x. 20, Luke reports the Spirit as having said to Peter, "Go with them, *nothing doubting*." But here, if the Revisers' reading is correct,

Peter is reported as saying, that the Spirit bade him "go with them, *making no distinction*." This certainly is a distinction with a decided difference, not to say an incompatibility of meaning. If the Spirit's bidding to Peter was as recorded in x. 20, it cannot be what the Revisers' text here says it was. This text, however, misrepresents Luke. It is language which some early reader thought to be more appropriate for Peter to employ under the circumstances than the Spirit's bidding. To him it appeared unsuitable for Peter to defend his course by saying that he was told to go unhesitatingly. It was better to say, that he was bidden to go without making any distinction between Jews and Gentiles,—an idea which he readily gathered from the context.

xi. 21.

Rec. T. *πολὺς τε ἀριθμὸς πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεφεν*—and a great number believed, and turned.

Rev. T. *πολὺς τε ἀριθμὸς ὁ πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεφεν*—and a great number that believed turned.

The received reading is supported by D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac Version, and Chrysostom. The other is the reading of *Σ*, A, B, 36, 61, 180, and a catena. The presence of the article makes the words mean that a great number who became believers on this occasion turned to the Lord. But this is not all. It implies either that some who believed did not turn to the Lord, or else that some who turned to the Lord did not believe. That is to say, the presence of the article, to be of any significance, requires us to understand the clause as meaning either that a great number, but not all, that believed, turned to the Lord; or else that a great number that believed, to say nothing of others who did not believe, turned to the Lord. Compare the sentence, "Very many who saw him were convinced of the truth of the report." This does not mean that all who saw him were convinced, or that none but those who saw him were convinced; but that of those

who saw many were convinced. So the revised reading can only mean that of those who believed or became believers on this occasion, a great number turned to the Lord. To make the sentence read as Luke must have written it, the article should be rejected: "A great number having believed turned to the Lord"; or, as the A. V. has it, "A great number believed, and (as the immediate consequence) turned to the Lord."

xi. 22.

Rec. T. ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν διελθεῖν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας — they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch.

Rev. T. ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας — they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch.

The common reading is that of D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Thebaic and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Chrysostom. The other is supported by $\aleph$, A, B, 61, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. But evidently διελθεῖν was early omitted as superfluous. If Luke had not written it, there would have been no temptation for any one else to insert it; for there is nothing objectionable in the reading, "They sent Barnabas forth to Antioch," — ἕως in the sense of "to" or "unto" being a common use of the word with Luke. See Luke iv. 42, xi. 51; Acts i. 8, viii. 10, ix. 38, xiii. 47, etc.

xi. 23.

"Some ancient authorities," says the marginal note, — that is, the Vatican Codex, the eleventh-century cursive 40, and the two Egyptian Versions, — read, "that they would cleave unto the purpose of their heart in the Lord." But the word ἐν seems to have been inserted simply for the sake of definitely fixing the supposed meaning. The rendering "to cleave to," or "adhere to," or "abide by," shows the true meaning here of the verb προσμένειν. In a local sense, denoting continuance

in a place, the verb would very naturally be accompanied by ἐν, "in," as in 1 Tim. i. 3. But here, as in Matt. xv. 32, and in Mark viii. 2, or in 1 Tim. v. 5, the preposition is wholly uncalled for, and is, no doubt, spurious.

xii. 5.

Rec. T. προσευχή δὲ ἣν ἐκτενῆς γινομένη — but prayer was made without ceasing. [In the margin, these words are more properly rendered, "but instant and earnest prayer was made."]

Rev. T. προσευχή δὲ ἣν ἐκτενῶς γινομένη — but prayer was made earnestly.

The Received Text follows the reading of A second hand, E, H, L, P, 61, and nearly all the other cursives, a catena, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and Severianus. The Revised adopts that of $\aleph$, B, and what seems to be the original reading of A, three cursives, the Latin Version *e*, the Vulgate, and Lucifer. But these Latin "authorities," as well as D, which reads ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ, take the word in the sense of incessantly, or without ceasing, as our A. V. does in the text, which is inadmissible. Luke's word is not the adverb, but the adjective. He is speaking of the *character* of the prayer that was going up on Peter's behalf, — earnest, intent, as with feelings drawn out to the utmost on his behalf, — not of the manner of offering it, or of the frequency of it.

xii. 25.

The "many ancient authorities" to which the note refers as reading "returned to Jerusalem" instead of "returned from Jerusalem," are $\aleph$, B, H, L, P, 61, and about thirty-five other cursives, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Roman Ethiopic, the Arabic of the Paris Polyglot, some manuscripts of Chrysostom, and Theophylact. A few cursives read "returned to Antioch," instead. The text is supported by A (C

is defective here), a number of cursives, the Peshito Syriac Version, as well as the text of the Philoxenian, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, and some of the manuscripts of Chrysostom; while D, E, nearly twenty cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and one manuscript of Chrysostom, read ἀπό, "from," instead of ἐξ, "from." Then again, between twenty and thirty of these documents that read "from" (embracing some that read ἐξ and some that read ἀπό), notably E, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, and Erpenius' Arabic Version, read "from Jerusalem to Antioch." A variety of readings surely sufficiently great to please almost any lover of varying texts. The marginal reading cannot, from the nature of the case, be the true reading; yet the accepted reading, which the context plainly calls for, lacks the strong support of nearly all the uncials, — a comparatively rare occurrence respecting a genuine reading. Westcott and Hort conjecture "that the original order was τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν," — adding that "the article is more liable than other words to careless transposition."¹ But this collocation, besides being without a shadow of support, makes such Greek as Luke could not have written. It embraces between the article and its noun the word πληρώσαντες, so making it an adjunct and modifier of that noun instead of its governing word. In order to express their idea of the possible original meaning, the order would need to be either πληρώσαντες τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ διακονίαν, or πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *i.e.* "having fulfilled their ministry to Jerusalem." But either of these transpositions, with nothing whatever to support it, is too violent a wresting of the writer's language to find acceptance in any quarter. That εἰς early and easily crept into the text, in place of ἐξ, need not be doubted. In xi. 29, 30, we read that the disciples at Antioch sent relief to "the brethren that dwelt *in Judea*" by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Then follows an episode, relating what

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 94.

happened "about that time," possibly before Barnabas and Saul left Antioch, — this digression occupying all but the last two verses of chapter xii. At verse 24 of that chapter, Luke resumes his narrative respecting affairs at Antioch, — not very many days having elapsed between the events of xi. 30 and those of xii. 24, 25. But some early reader seems to have perused this portion of the Acts under several false impressions. In the first place, he must have taken the words, "the brethren residing in Judea" (xi. 29) to mean the brethren that were dwelling in various parts of Judea, instead of simply the brethren in Jerusalem. Then he seems to have regarded the circumstances narrated in xii. 1-19 as necessarily occurring *after* Barnabas and Saul had left Antioch. He may also have considered the statements in verses 20-23 as made concerning Herod while he was yet in Jerusalem, instead of while spending his last days at Cesarea. Under some or all of these impressions, he would naturally have supposed that Barnabas and Saul, very soon after arriving in Jerusalem from Antioch, left the city and spent the time in passing up and down through Judea visiting the brethren, till after the death of Herod, when they "returned *to* Jerusalem," having fulfilled their ministry *in Judea*, to aid them in which they had taken Mark along with them. This will account at once for the introduction of εἰς in place of ἐξ, — the latter having been naturally considered an erroneous reading. Hence, too, the appearance of εἰς in so many of the uncials. Instead of going through Judea, however, Barnabas and Saul went directly from Antioch to Jerusalem, "fulfilled their ministry," that is, turned over to the brethren there the funds they had brought for their relief, and very soon after returned to Antioch, or, as the text has it, "returned from Jerusalem," taking Mark along with them.

xiii. 18.

Here, instead of the reading of the text, ἐτροποφόρησεν, "he suffered their manners," the margins of both the Authorized and

the Revised New Testament give *ἐτροφοφόρησεν*, "he nourished them with fatherly care." This, which is regarded as the true reading by the American Revisers, is attested by A, C first hand, E, eight or ten cursives, the Latin Version of Codex D (which is rather significant, being opposed not only to its own Greek but to the Latin Versions generally), the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, and Erpenius' Arabic; to which may be added the testimony of the Apostolic Constitutions, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Septuagint Version of 2 Maccab. vii. 27. The common reading is that of *Σ*, B, C second hand, D, H, L, P, 61, and the great majority of the cursives, the catenas, the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen, and possibly Chrysostom and Theophylact. The marginal reading has not the strong attestation of Greek manuscripts which the other has, though it is well supported by the Versions. But it certainly harmonizes better with the context, which refers, not so much to God's forbearance with his ancient people, as to his interpositions on their behalf, and his repeated favors and gifts to them. It was more appropriate to the occasion, too, than the reading of the text would have been. "It would hardly have suited the apostle's purpose," in addressing a Jewish audience whom he desired to please, "to have interposed, by way of parenthesis in the midst of his details of benefits received, the unwelcome suggestion of their obstinate ingratitude and of God's long forbearance." Hence, modern editors generally give the marginal reading the preference. It is the reading of Deut. i. 31, as given by A, B first hand, and most other manuscripts of the Septuagint, — the reading which was accepted in the apostolic age, and has been ever since, and which the Anglo-American Revisers of 1885 have there given to the Hebrew verb, as did their predecessors of 1611. There are, in fact, strong reasons for believing that it is the original reading. Origen translated the Hebrew verb in Deut. i. 31 by *ἐτροποφόρησεν*, "he put up with their conduct," because

the apparent comparison of God to a nurse seemed to him unsuitable, and was rather repulsive than otherwise; and for the same reason that reading, which appeared very plausible, was adopted by others. Hence, doubtless, its appearance in most of the uncials and cursives here.

xiii. 19, 20.

Rec. T. *κατεκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς* — he divided to them their land by lot. And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years.

Rev. T. *κατεκληρονόμησε τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκε κριτὰς* — he gave *them* their land for an inheritance, for about four hundred and fifty years: and after these things he gave *them* judges.

The change from *κατεκληροδότησεν* to *κατεκληρονόμησε* is as it should be: the former is a later and feebly attested reading. But the omission of *αὐτοῖς* is one the propriety of which may be questioned. As for the rest of the passage, the reading of the Received Text is supported by D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, and the two Ethiopic Versions; D, however, as well as the Peshito Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, and the Roman Ethiopic omit the phrase, "after these things." The revised reading is that of *Σ*, A, B, C, 61, and six other cursives, the catenas, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Thebaic Version, which also omits "after these things." Tischendorf says that the united authority of the four oldest manuscripts should not be abandoned except for most weighty and sufficiently evident reasons. Yet, in verse 33, he abandons it, as do Lachmann and Tregelles, to read, in accordance with D, Origen, Hilary, and others, "the first psalm" instead of "the second psalm." Of course, the united testimony of the oldest manuscripts is not to be lightly set aside. At the same time, there is such a thing as being slavishly bound to it, and following it

as if it were infallible. The textual critic must seek to avoid both extremes. In the passage before us, according to the Revised Text, the apostle says, apparently, that God gave the Israelites the land of Canaan to be their inheritance for only about four hundred and fifty years. But this, plainly enough, is not the apostle's meaning. Humphry, while not venturing an explanation of the meaning of the Revised Text here, simply says that, by the transposition of phrases which the Revisers have made, "the discrepancy is avoided, which the common text presents, between the statement of S. Paul and the received chronology of the Old Testament as to the interval from the exodus to the time of Samuel the prophet."¹ Without attempting any explanation of our own concerning this "discrepancy," which plainly enough led to the monstrous reading adopted by the Revisers, we prefer to quote the comment of Dr. Hackett on the passage: "This number is the sum of the years assigned in the Old Testament to the administration of the judges . . . added to the sum of the years during which the nation was subject to foreign oppressors. Hence it would be very natural for the Jews to speak of four hundred and fifty years as the proximate number of years during which the judges ruled. But whether the computation arose in that way, or in some other, it was certainly in use among the Jews; for Josephus (*Antiquities* VIII. ii. 1) gives the time from the departure out of Egypt till the building of the temple as five hundred and ninety-two years. If we deduct from that the forty years in the wilderness, twenty-five for the administration of Joshua (*Antiquities* V. i. 29, — not stated in the Old Testament), forty for Saul's reign, forty for David's, and four under Solomon (1 Kings vi. 1), we have for the period of the judges four hundred and forty-three years, which the apostle could call, in round numbers, *about four hundred and fifty years*. It is evident that Paul has followed here a mode of reckoning which was current at that time,

¹ *Commentary on the R. V.*, p. 219.

and which, being a well-known received chronology, whether correct or incorrect in itself considered, was entirely correct for his object, which was not to settle a question about dates, but to recall to the minds of those whom he addressed, a particular portion of the Jewish history."¹ The revised reading is the result of an attempt to obviate a difficulty which thus appears to have no real existence. Compare Meyer, who, in his note on this verse, agrees with Hackett.

xiii. 25.

Rec. T. Τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ. — Whom think ye that I am? I am not *he*.

Rev. T. Τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ. — What suppose ye that I am? I am not *he*.

The former of these readings is according to C, D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The latter follows Σ, A, B, 61, the Thebaic, and the Ethiopic Version. The original reading, probably, was τίνα με; and the form of the sentence interrogative. But, on account of the ellipsis of αὐτός in the clause following the question, the words were early and somewhat widely misunderstood, and the two clauses taken declaratively as forming one sentence: "I am not the one whom ye suppose me to be." But, as the construction appeared somewhat harsh, τίνα not being a relative, and yet equivalent to ὃν or ὃντινα, "the one whom," τίνα με seems to have been considered a transcriptional error for τί ἐμέ, to which it was accordingly changed, — τί being less harsh, and rendering the sentence more plainly declarative, as Tischendorf makes it, and as others still insist it should be: "What ye suppose me to be, I am not"; or, "I am not what ye suppose me to be." If this had been the original reading, it seems hardly probable that it would ever have been changed to the

¹ *Commentary on the Acts*.

other, which is inherently the harder reading. The other, however, is sufficiently attested, and should be retained as the true reading, introducing a question: "Whom do ye suppose me to be?"

xiii. 33.

Rec. T. ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν, — God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children.

Rev. T. ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν, — God hath fulfilled the same unto our children.

The first of these readings is found in C as amended by its second corrector, E, H, L, P, 61, and nearly every other cursive, the catenas, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The revised reading is that of **S**, A, B, C first hand, D, the Vulgate (except one manuscript which reads "your"), both Ethiopic Versions, Hilary (sometimes reading "your," however), Ambrose, and Bede. The Memphitic Version reads "unto the children," and the Thebaic, "unto their children." The eleventh-century cursive 76, alone reads, "unto us, the children." We cannot resist the conclusion that the Received as well as the Revised Text fails to present to us Luke's words as he wrote them. We go farther: we are convinced that the true reading has come down to us in the single cursive 76, which reads τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῖν, "to us the children," — the words "the children" corresponding to "the fathers," in the preceding verse. But the meaning, and consequently the construction, not being understood, ἡμῖν was early thought to be a transcriptional error, and so became changed to ἡμῶν. Hence the appearance of this form in the five oldest uncials and in Jerome's Latin Version. Others, however, who saw that ἡμῖν was in apposition with τέκνοις, in order to render the text clear to others, inserted αὐτῶν between the two words. Hence the received reading, which is that of the cursives generally. The translators of the two Egyptian Versions dropped ἡμῖν; the one writing "the chil-

dren," and the other, "their children." Westcott and Hort admit that the "text [*i.e.* the Revised Text] which alone has any adequate authority . . . gives only an improbable sense. It can hardly be doubted that ἡμῶν is a primitive corruption of ἡμῖν, — τοὺς πατέρας and τοῖς τέκνοις being alike absolute. The suggestion is due to Bornemann, who cites x. 41 in illustration."¹ There certainly is something exceedingly incongruous in Paul's being represented as saying that God had "completely fulfilled" his promise to "our children," many of whom were yet unborn! — entirely overlooking the parents, whom he was addressing and the very ones, apparently, to whom the promise was fulfilled.

xv. 24.

Rec. T. ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα · — subverting your souls, saying, *Ye must* be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no *such* commandment.

Rev. T. ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα · — subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment.

In support of the received reading, we have C, E, H, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The revised reading follows **S**, A, B, D, 13, 61, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Roman Ethiopic, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Athanasius. Epiphanius omits the words, "subverting your souls," as well as the clause that follows; and Origen, in quoting the passage, stops short at the words "have troubled you." The omitted words are, no doubt, a part of the original text. They were probably omitted through oversight, because of the resemblance between ὕμῶν, the last syllable before the omission, and νόμον, the last syllable of the omitted clause. It is very generally supposed, however, that they were supplied by some later hand from verse 1 or 5. But, since those verses show that the necessity of circumcision

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 95.

was the very question in reference to which Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to confer with the brethren there, it is by no means probable that those brethren in their reply would have said nothing whatever in regard to the matter, especially in alluding to what they had heard concerning certain ones that had gone to them from Jerusalem. Besides, the words οἷς οὐ διεστείλάμεθα, that immediately follow, show clearly that the omitted clause is a part of the original text. If these words are properly translated, they will be represented in English, not by "to whom we gave no commandment,"—which comes in rather awkwardly,—but, as in the Peshito Syriac Version, by "things which we have not commanded," or rather "*in respect to which things* (that is, circumcision and the keeping of the Mosaic law) we have given no commandment." The dative here denotes *that in reference to which* the action is done. (Winer, § 31, 6.) It is a common New-Testament use of the dative, as in Rom. vi. 20, "Ye were free *in regard of* righteousness." R. V.¹ If the words which the Revisers have omitted had been omitted from the letter to the brethren at Antioch, we question whether they would have "rejoiced for the consolation" or encouragement afforded them by that letter, as we are informed (verse 31) they did. On the contrary, the letter would probably have proved very unsatisfactory if the main subject concerning which they sought information and advice had been utterly ignored.

¹ Other instances abound, though the dative is usually translated by "in." Matt. xiii. 14 (R. V.), "*unto* them is fulfilled"; (A. V.) "*in* them" etc.; *i.e. in regard to* them. Acts vii. 51, "uncircumcised *in* [*i.e. as to*] heart and ears"; xiv. 8, "impotent *in* his feet"; xvi. 5, "strengthened *in* the faith," or *in regard to* their faith; xviii. 2, "a man of Pontus *by* race," or *as to* nationality. Numerous other examples may be had by a reference to Winer's *Grammar of the New Testament Diction*.

XV. 34.

Rec. T. ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ. — Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.

The Revisers omit this verse, with the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities insert, with variations, verse 34." It is generally considered that the verse is an interpolation, made with reference to Silas only, and with a view to account for the statement in verse 40: "But Paul chose Silas, and departed" etc.,—a statement which seems to imply very strongly that Silas was in Antioch at the time. From a careful examination of verses 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, we cannot see that any but the four brethren—Judas, Silas, Paul, and Barnabas—were sent down to Antioch with the letter and message from the apostles at Jerusalem. So that we are not justified in supposing that the statement of verse 33 has reference to any others. We are told in verse 35 that two of these brethren "tarried in Antioch," instead of returning to Jerusalem. Of the other two, if verse 34 is omitted, nothing seems to be said; but the reader is left to infer that they returned to Jerusalem. This verse is wanting in Σ , A, B, E, H, L, P, 61, and about sixty other cursives. It is wanting, also, in two copies of the Old Latin Version, one of the Vulgate, and some copies of the Syriac and Memphitic Versions, besides being unrecognized by Chrysostom, and by Theophylact in one form of his commentary. But it is attested by C, D, most of the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, some copies of the Peshito, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. Instead of the accepted reading, αὐτοῦ, "there," which seems to be a later reading, C and D have αὐτοῦς, "them." Taking this as the original ending of the verse, we find that it agrees with the ending of verse 33; and this enables us to account at once for the absence of verse 34 from some of the documents. It was omitted by *homoioteleuton*,—the result of oversight on the part of an early transcriber.

Then, as to its import, it may be said that ἔδοξε means, in a general way, "it seemed good"; but the word does not necessarily indicate that Silas kept his thought to himself. It sometimes denotes the *expression* of an opinion. And this is what it seems to mean here. Silas suggested to his brethren that they had better not return to Jerusalem. With the reading αὐτοῦς instead of αὐτοῦ in the Greek of verse 34, the three verses may be rendered consecutively as follows: "Now, *after they had spent some time there*, they were given full liberty by the brethren [at Antioch] to return [if they wished] to those that had sent them forth. But Silas thought best [and *proposed*] *that they continue* [or persevere, *i.e.* in the evangelistic work in which they were engaged]. And Paul and Barnabas prolonged their stay in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also." There was evidently a great work on their hands. Of course, Silas, who proposed remaining, and Judas, who was his co-worker (verse 32), remained also. Luke did not consider it necessary to state this after what he had said in verses 32, 34, but left it to be taken for granted by his readers. The connection between verse 34 and the context is perfect. It calls for no forced rendering; while the omission of the verse is easily and naturally accounted for. The words of the sacred penman must not be rashly set aside.

xvi. 13.

Rec. T. οὐ ἐνομίζετο προσευχῇ εἶναι, — where prayer was wont to be made.

Rev. T. οὐ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, — where we supposed there was a place of prayer.

The documents are greatly at variance here. The Received Text follows the reading of E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, two catenæ, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Codex D and the Old Latin and Vulgate read: "where there seemed (ἔδόκει) to be a place of prayer." A and B, apparently: "where we expected

to be in a place of prayer." The Sinaitic Codex: "where he thought that there was a place of prayer." The Peshito Syriac: "because a house of prayer was seen there." The Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions have still other readings, no two of which are alike. The revised reading seems to be that of C, 13, 40, 61, and possibly the Roman Ethiopic Version. But these various readings evidently arose from a misunderstanding of Luke's meaning, which, it would seem, is expressed with sufficient clearness by the Received Text: "Where was wont to be a place of prayer"; *i.e.* where the Jews of Philippi were accustomed to meet for prayer. Verse 16 shows that it was more than "a supposition" with Paul and his companions in regard to this place of prayer. After finding it to be such, Luke would hardly have written "where we supposed"; he would rather have said, "where we *found*," if he had intended to record their own thoughts or experience concerning it.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς — this Jesus . . . is Christ.

Rev. T. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς — this Jesus . . . is the Christ.

There is much diversity here among the manuscripts in regard to the use of the article. B alone upholds the Revised Text. Codices A, D, and 61, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, the printed Armenian, and Chrysostom on one page read "Christ Jesus" without any article (and so Tischendorf and some others), making the two words, properly speaking, one name. The Sinaitic Codex, the single cursive 38, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, and the manuscripts of the Armenian Version do the same, only they transpose the two words, and read "Jesus Christ." The received reading is that of H, L, P, most of the cursives, and Theophylact; while that of E, a few cursives, a catena, and Chrysostom on the

page following that above referred to, by transferring these terms, make Luke say, "This one is Jesus, — the Christ whom I preach unto you." In the reading of B, which the Revisers, following Westcott and Hort, have adopted, the presence of the article before Ἰησοῦς indicates either that the latter is to be construed with οὗτος, — "this Jesus," — as the Revisers have construed it, though the position of the words does not really favor this construction; or else that it is meant to point out more particularly which Jesus is referred to; in which case, the true rendering would be, "and that this is the Christ, *the* Jesus whom I proclaim unto you"; as in xix. 13, "I adjure you by *the* Jesus whom Paul preacheth." It is not usual for Codex B to prefix the article to Ἰησοῦς, unless the latter is coupled with οὗτος, or required to be particularized in some such way as this. This reading, if it can be legitimately construed as the Revisers have taken it, certainly yields an excellent meaning; but, apart from the questionable construction, as it is found only in B and has the appearance of being a critical emendation, it can scarcely be adopted with any degree of confidence as a genuine reading. If we accept the reading of the Received Text, the proper rendering of the verse is not that of the A. V. It should rather be, "Expounding them, and showing that the Christ needed to suffer and to rise from the dead; and that this one, — Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you, — is the Christ." This requires no article before Ἰησοῦς, and gives the words in the natural order in which we should expect to find them, — "This is the Christ, [namely] Jesus, whom I proclaim."

xvii. 14.

Rec. T. πορεύεσθαι ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν · — to go as it were to the sea.
 Rev. T. πορεύεσθαι ἕως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν · — to go as far as to the sea.

The common reading ὡς is supported by H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Chrysostom. The revised is that of **Σ**, A, B, E,

61, and seven or eight other cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and the Memphitic. Codex D, about ten cursives, the Thebaic and Ethiopic Versions omit the word. The truth is, ὡς was misunderstood; hence it was early changed in some copies, as if to make its meaning sure, to ἕως, "as far as"; while in others it was dropped as superfluous. Its use here is found nowhere else in the New Testament; but it is a common classical use of the word, which Luke would be very likely to make in this connection. As the elder Buttmann says, when "prefixed to the prepositions ἐπί, εἰς, πρὸς, in answer to the question *whither*, . . . it gives them the signification *towards, in the direction of*; literally *as if*, leaving it undetermined whether the point aimed at is reached. Thus, Thucyd. vi. 61, ἀπέπλεον μετὰ τῆς Σαλαμινίας ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας ὡς εἰς Ἀθήνας, 'They sailed away in company with the Salaminia from Sicily *towards* [literally *as for*] Athens.' It can everywhere be used of a journey not yet completed."¹ So here, it denotes the apostle's intention of going to the sea, — "The brethren at once sent Paul forth" from Berea, "that he might continue on his way *seaward*," or toward the Gulf of Salonica, some twenty miles distant, as he intended to do, and there take passage for Athens.

xvii. 26.

Rec. T. ἐποίησέ τε ἐνὸς αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος — and hath made of one blood all nations.

Rev. T. ἐποίησέ τε ἐνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος — and he made of one every nation.

The Received Text follows D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Theodoret twice, Chrysostom repeatedly, Cosmas of Alexandria, Theophylact, and Bede. The Revisers' reading is that of **Σ**, A, B, 61, and seven or eight other cursives, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, Platt's Ethiopic, and

¹ Buttmann's *Greek Grammar*, § 149, m. 1.

Clement of Alexandria. The latter reading, however, is an early alteration, made on the ground that it is more rational to speak of every nation as descended from "one nation" than from "one blood." If ἐνός, "one (nation)," had been the original reading, it might have been changed to "one man," or "one couple," but never to "one blood." The idea of the apostle is that God made the world of mankind from one common life-principle, which, in accordance with Jewish views, was in the blood.

xviii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐργάζετο — he abode with them, and wrought.

Rev. T. ἐμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡργάζοντο — he abode with them, and they wrought.

The singular is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, A (C is defective here), D, E, H, L, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The plural is the reading given by the original scribe of **Σ**, B, the Memphitic Version, and Origen as represented by his Latin interpreter, who makes him say *et operabantur simul*, "and they wrought together"; which may express Luke's meaning, but certainly is not what Luke wrote. Both verbs were, doubtless, originally in the singular, and spoke concerning Paul. But on account of the plural "with *them*," and the plural "they were" which follows immediately after, ἐργάζετο became easily drawn into the plural also. But the plural seems to have found very limited acceptance, and to have been soon abandoned as false. It will be observed that "with them" is connected with "he abode," but not with "he wrought"; because the meaning is not that he wrought with Aquila and Priscilla, but only lived with them, and wrought with Aquila. This last, however, is not stated in words. But it is implied in what follows: "For they by their occupation were tent-makers";—that is, not

Aquila and Priscilla as some suppose, but the two men, Paul and Aquila. The reading, "He abode with them, and they wrought," implies not that Paul and Aquila worked together, but that Aquila and Priscilla did the working, for by occupation they were tent-makers, while Paul possibly was engaged in preaching or doing something else,—thus making the last clause of the verse appear as giving a reason why the husband and wife could not be idle, not as a reason why Paul worked with Aquila.

xviii. 7.

Rec. T. ὀνόματι Ἰούστου, — named Justus.

Rev. T. ὀνόματι Τίτου Ἰούστου, — named Titus Justus.

The received reading is that of A, B third hand (C is defective here), D first hand, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Latin Version of Codex D, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. The revised follows **Σ**, E, four cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Theophylact in the other form. The original scribe of B, the first corrector of D, and the Philoxenian Syriac give "Titius" instead of "Titus." The Peshito Syriac and Thebaic Versions read "Titus" instead of "Justus." Bede, commenting on the name *Titi Justī*, which appeared in his Latin New Testament, says, "In Greek, the name is written *Justus*," which is doubtless the original and only name as given by Luke. The additional name, "Titus," arose from repeating the last syllable of the preceding word and the first three letters of the following word, so making ὀνόματι Τίτου Ἰούστου out of ὀνομαΤΙΙΟΥστου, the second Ι requiring only a horizontal mark at the top to change it to a Τ; and this the scribe may indeed have found there, or thought was there. This Τίτου became changed in B, and two other documents, to Τιτίου; while in two versions it superseded the original "Justus." In cursive 98, τοῦ Τίτου is written over Ἰούστου; while, apparently on account of perplexity in determining what the name really

was, the copyists of 2, and 30, omitted the whole expression, "named Justus," or, "named Titus Justus," or, "named Titus Justus." The very changes through which the word passed, and to which it led, to say nothing of its obvious origin, are enough to condemn it as a false reading.

xviii. 21.

Rec. T. εἰπὼν· Δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι ἐν Ἱεροσόλυμα· πάλιν δὲ ἀνακάμψω — saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem; but I will return again.

Rev. T. εἰπὼν, Πάλιν ἀνακάμψω — saying, I will return again.

The former of these readings is found in D, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in both copies of his commentary. The latter is that of **Σ**, A, B, E, less than ten cursives, all but one copy of the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and the Roman Ethiopic. The reference to attending the feast at Jerusalem is wanting in the three oldest extant manuscripts; yet it is not impossible that it might have been early omitted, from the fact that the record in the next verse does not seem to favor it. From that record, one might infer that the apostle went up to Jerusalem, saluted the church, and immediately proceeded to Antioch. But it should be observed that, in both that verse and the one following it, the historian is very brief in his mention of Paul's movements, barely mentioning certain points, and passing on, — the element of time scarcely claiming his attention. Besides, if the omitted words — which are evidently given as the apostle's reason why he could not consent to remain longer in Ephesus at this time — are not genuine, it seems hardly possible that, in view of the record in verse 22, any one else would have represented him as uttering them. It is true, they bear a kind of resemblance to Luke's words concerning him in xx. 16. But there, everything favors such a

statement, while here there is no apparent temptation for another to represent the apostle as speaking of the necessity of being in Jerusalem at the feast.

xix. 14.

Rec. T. οἱ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες. — which did so.

Rev. T. τοῦτο ποιοῦντες. — which did this.

The article is attested by E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Armenian. It is wanting in **Σ**, A, B, seven cursives, and the Memphitic Version. C is defective here, and D has an altogether different reading. After omitting the article, the Revisers should not have retained the rendering of the A. V. The only proper translation that their Greek admits is, "And there were seven sons of one Sceva . . . *doing* this"; unless ἦσαν, at one end of the sentence, and ποιοῦντες, at the other, are taken together and rendered, "And seven sons of Sceva *were doing* this thing." The truth is, οἱ was early dropped on account of its recurrence after υἱοί, which led to its being overlooked. Its presence, as in the Received Text, is necessary to express the idea that there were seven sons "who did" this thing. The Revisers have incorrectly translated their own Greek, which is supposed to be correct; that is all.

xix. 16.

Rec. T. κατακυριεύσας αὐτῶν, — overcame them.

Rev. T. κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων, — mastered both of them.

The whole verse, as revised, reads, "And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and mastered both of them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." Both of whom? Apparently, of the sons of Sceva; but of these there are seven referred to just before. No two of them are singled out from the rest. Then again, after saying that the man in whom the evil spirit was had "mastered" both of them, why should Luke have added,

"and prevailed against" them? Does not "mastering" mean "prevailing against"? It is not like Luke to repeat his thoughts after this style. It must be obvious to every one that there is a mistranslation here, or that the text has become grossly corrupted; or possibly there is a little of both. Αὐτῶν is the reading of H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, and the Thebaic, which also adds "seven," — making it read, "mastered the seven." The Roman Ethiopic reads, "mastered them all." Ἀμφοτέρων is supported by $\aleph$, A, B, D, about fifteen cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Theophylact in one of his commentaries. Owing to the strong testimony in attestation of the latter reading, and the difficulty of accounting for the presence of ἀμφοτέρων if it is not genuine, it must be accepted as the true reading. The others are only variations due to a misunderstanding of Luke's meaning. And yet we cannot, for a moment, accept Meyer's interpretation that "the mode of representation is not exact, as we only see from ἀμφοτέρων that, of those seven sons, but *two* on this occasion were active, *whom Luke has already conceived to himself in* [the foregoing] αὐτοῦς." This is not in accordance with Luke's mode of expressing himself. He speaks as truly of the seven in αὐτοῦς as he does in the preceding αὐτοῖς, or his words are meaningless. It is this misunderstanding of Luke's meaning which has led not only to the substitution of αὐτῶν for ἀμφοτέρων, but to several other changes, such as the omission of καί after ἀμφοτέρων, the writing of κυριεύσας and κατεκυρίενσεν for κατακυριεύσας, to say nothing of still other variations, which have also led to a mistranslation of his words. Indeed, κατακυριεύσας is not above suspicion. Codex A reads κατεκυρίενσαν ἀμφοτέρων, "they mastered both of them." In the first half of this, A is supported by E, H, L, P, forty-five cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in at least one form of his commentaries; and in the latter half, as stated above, by $\aleph$, B, D, etc. And this, we believe, gives us the original reading, κατεκυρίενσαν ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ ἵσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν, etc. Thus worded, the verse may be

rendered, "And when the man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, they [Sceva's sons] overcame both [the demoniac and the demon]; yet it went hard with them [*i.e.* with the exorcists, — literally, 'it availed *against them*'], so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." The last clause is added to show that although Sceva's seven sons succeeded in mastering their assailants, it was a dearly bought victory. It was not such an exercise of power as Paul displayed. The use of καί, which we insert from Codices 105, 184, in the sense of "but," or "yet," is not uncommon. It appears in Luke xiii. 7, Acts x. 28, and elsewhere throughout the New Testament. On the use of the nominative absolute with a participle, as here, see Buttmann's *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, American edition, p. 298.

xix. 34.

The Revisers have made no change here in the form of the participle translated "when they knew." The genitive found in the text is the grammatical form properly required by the connection. But this is an obvious correction, supported by only a few cursives and a catena. The nominative ἐπιγινόντες, which is not often found thus absolute, is attested by all the uncials, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in both his commentaries. It is but another instance of the same unusual construction that appears in verse 16, upon which we have just been commenting. The historian, in both that verse and this, after having begun to write, changed his mind, doubtless unconsciously, respecting the construction, and proceeded with his sentence, without conforming to the precise customary laws of expression.¹ The change, it is true, makes no difference in the meaning. But we are surprised that the Revisers, who seem to have been desirous of revising the Greek Text, as well as the English, should have left uncorrected a reading that no modern editor can consider genuine.

¹ See Butt., *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, § 144, m. 13, a, c. Winer, § 63, I., 1.

xx. 3.

Rec. T. ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν — he purposed to return.

Rev. T. ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν — he determined to return.

The nominative γνώμη, of the Received Text, is supported by B third hand, H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Greek marginal reading of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom. The genitive, of the Revised Text, is the reading of **Σ**, A, B first hand, E, ten or twelve cursives, and a catena. It is the reading which one would naturally expect to find here on the assumption that the sentence has a strictly grammatical construction. Hence, its presence in connection with an abnormal rival reading naturally awakens suspicion. If this genitive were the original reading, a scribe would not have been tempted to write γνώμη, when by so doing he would of necessity leave the participle ποιήσας, at the beginning of the verse, in the nominative absolute, or rather without an apodosis, — a comparatively rare construction, but one to which Luke was somewhat given, as we have seen in the two preceding notes. The meaning of the words is substantially the same, whichever reading is adopted. If, however, the genuineness of the reading must be determined, intrinsic probability strongly favors the retention of the nominative. Literally, the rendering would be, "And having tarried [*i.e.* when he had tarried] three months, . . . a decision was made [*i.e.* it was thought best] to return through Macedonia." This conclusion seems to have been reached after consultation among the brethren. Hence the form that Luke gave to his statement, using γνώμη instead of γνώμης. The latter would indicate that the decision was Paul's alone.

xx. 5.

Rec. T. οὗτοι προελθόντες — These going before.

Rev. T. οὗτοι δὲ προελθόντες — But these had gone before.

The "but" of the Revised Text is found in **Σ**, A, B, E, ten or twelve cursives, the Memphitic and Philoxenian Syriac Ver-

sions, and Theophylact in one of his commentaries. It is wanting in D, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. It seems to have crept into the text at an early day, as in many other places, to connect the verse with what precedes, and possibly through impressions received from the context itself, in which the word appears again and again. — Προελθόντες, "having come unto," which is referred to in the margin as found instead of προελθόντες in many ancient manuscripts, is simply an early clerical error in writing προσ- for προ-, and is one of common occurrence; as in verse 13, in A, B first hand, E, H, P, more than forty cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact; in xii. 10, in D, L, and ten or a dozen cursives; and in Luke i. 17, in B first hand, C, L, V, and several cursives.

xxi. 22.

Rec. T. πάντως δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν· ἀκούσονται γὰρ ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. — the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come.

Rev. T. πάντως ἀκούσονται ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. — they will certainly hear that thou art come.

The common reading here is attested by **Σ**, A, C second hand, D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and Chrysostom; the revised, by B, C first hand, five or six cursives, the two Egyptian Versions, the Philoxenian Syriac, both Ethiopic Versions, and the Armenian, which also omits "certainly." The Peshito Syriac clips the verse down still more, and makes it read, "Now, because they will hear that thou hast come"; in which it is followed by Erpenius' Arabic Version. The revised reading seems to be one of numberless examples indicating B's readiness to adopt an abbreviated text, its transcriber almost everywhere showing a disposition to abridge by rejecting what may have appeared to him to be superfluous or unintelligible. In view of this, it is difficult to

understand why we should be expected to give up a portion of the accepted text which is not only strongly attested, but in perfect keeping with the context, and presents no real evidence of having been interpolated.

xxi. 24.

Rec. T. *ἵνα ξυρήσωνται τὴν κεφαλὴν*, — that they may shave their heads.

Rev. T. *ἵνα ξυρήσονται τὴν κεφαλὴν*, — that they may shave their heads.

The aorist subjunctive, of the Received Text, is attested by A, B third hand, C, D first hand (who, however, in his haste or carelessness omitted two letters, and wrote *ξυρωνται*), H, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The future indicative, of the Revised Text, — which is improperly translated “*may shave*,” — is the reading of **Σ**, B first hand, D as afterwards amended, E, P, and half a dozen cursives. It is simply an early change from the subjunctive to bring the word into conformity with the following *γνώσονται*, “*will know*,” which the scribe supposed to be also dependent on *ἵνα*, but which is really independent of it, as the Revisers make it. Others, under the same false impression respecting the construction, early changed *γνώσονται* to the subjunctive to make it correspond with *ξυρήσωνται*. Hence the reading *γνώσι*, of the Received Text, which the Revisers have justly rejected.

xxiii. 28.

The only ancient witnesses, referred to in the marginal note as omitting the clause, “*I brought him down unto their council*,” are B first hand, and 61. The contemporary reviser of B, however, corrected the error by placing the omitted clause in the margin. The Roman Ethiopic Version omits only the words “*unto their council*.” It was simply a transcriber's error, corrected soon afterward, and found elsewhere in but a single transcript.

xxiii. 30.

The “*many ancient authorities*” that add the rejected word, “*Farewell*,” are **Σ**, E, H, L, P, all the cursives but one, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, two copies of Jerome's Version, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The word is wanting in A, B, 13, two copies of the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Roman Ethiopic. It may have been added by some scribe, as the customary and proper epistolary close, and possibly introduced from xv. 29; but it is quite as likely to have been early omitted as unnecessary. The testimony in favor of retaining the word seems on the whole quite as strong as against it, unless it be the fact that a few of the later witnesses give the word in the plural instead of the singular.

xxv. 13.

Rec. T. *ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*. — to salute Festus.

Rev. T. *ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*. — and saluted Festus.

The former of these readings is apparently without the support of a single uncial. It is attested by 61, and most of the other cursives, a catena, the Latin Version of E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. Codex C apparently has both readings by different hands, but neither is clear; and D is defective. The latter reading is that of **Σ**, A, B, the Greek Text of E, H, L, P, about twenty cursives, the Memphitic, both Ethiopic Versions, and Theophylact in his other commentary. The Revisers must have adopted this reading in sheer desperation, from lack of what they considered sufficient evidence in support of the other. They virtually abandon it when they come to translate, and place the proper rendering in the margin, though it is improperly given, even there, by being noted as an alternative rendering, “*Or*, having

saluted," and not as the true one, "*Gr.* having saluted." The Revisers' reading denotes that Agrippa and Bernice had already saluted Festus before they came to Cesarea; whereas the other, and apparently the only possible reading, makes it appear that they came thither for the very purpose of paying their respects to him. The expression "and saluted" is not a translation of ἀσπασάμενοι, preceded as it is by a verb—κατήντησαν. It is only a makeshift. Dr. Hort, in his note on the word, says, "The authority for -άμενοι is absolutely overwhelming; and, as a matter of transmission, -όμενοι can be only a correction. Yet it is difficult to remain satisfied that there is no prior corruption of some kind";¹ that is, if we understand his meaning, no corruption prior to transmission. It may be difficult for one who seems to believe in the infallibility of second-, third-, and fourth-century copyists, to remain satisfied that there was no error of some kind in the original manuscript; but, for one who believes that all early copyists were fallible as well as later ones, there is no difficulty in being fully satisfied that Luke wrote the future participle here; while some early blundering scribe made him appear to have written the aorist. It requires but the change of a single letter; and the mistake thus made is one of frequent occurrence, and sometimes, as here, of a glaring character. Thus, in chapter xx. 22, A, the Greek texts of D and E, H, five or more cursives, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary, read τὰ συναντήσαντα, "which have befallen," in place of τὰ συναντήσοντα, "which are to befall" me. Similar to this is the writing of the aorist for the present participle in Matt. xiii. 18, where *Σ*'s original scribe, B, X, two cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom read τοῦ σπείραντος, "him that sowed,"—the true reading in verse 24,—instead of τοῦ σπείροντος, "the sower"; also in Matt. xxviii. 19, where B, D, read βαπτίσαντες for βαπτίζοντες, making Jesus teach that his followers should baptize men before making dis-

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 100.

ciples of them,—contrary to all apostolic practice. In Acts viii. 32, *Σ*, A, C, E, H, L, some twenty cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and the Paschal Chronicle also read τοῦ κείραντος αὐτόν, "the one that sheared him," instead of τοῦ κείροντος αὐτόν, "the one shearing him," or "his shearer." In Acts xxviii. 23, *Σ* has διαμαρτυράμενος, "having testified," for διαμαρτυρόμενος, "testifying"; and B repeatedly has δύνομαι and δυνόμενος for δύναμαι and δυνάμενος,—which presents the reverse error of writing ο for α. All this shows that we cannot be governed altogether by manuscript "authority," even if it is "overwhelming"; especially when that authority is, in all probability, if not obviously, an early transcriptional error.

xxvi. 16.

Rec. T. ὧν τε εἶδες — both of these things which thou hast seen.

Rev. T. ὧν τε εἶδες με — both of the things wherein thou hast seen me.

Appended to this, in the Revisers' margin, is the note, "Many ancient authorities read *which thou hast seen*." This of course is the common reading. It is attested by *Σ*, A, C second hand (D is defective), E, H, I, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic Versions. Augustine adds *a me*, "from me." The Revisers' reading is that of B, C first hand, 105, 137, a few lectionaries, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and Ambrose. This reading appears to have originated in a desire to render the two relative clauses symmetrical, and alike in construction: "those things *in which* thou hast seen me, and those *in which* I shall appear unto thee";—*i.e.* in which thou shalt yet see me. Besides being thus open to suspicion, its attestation seems hardly sufficient to demand a displacement of what is apparently the genuine text, and one that is abundantly vouched for. The ὧν in both instances is equivalent to ἐκείνων *α*,—the relative in the latter instance being without the governing κατά, which is a not

infrequent construction. The two clauses may accordingly be rendered, "both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those [in reference to] which I will appear unto thee."

xxvi. 20.

Rec. T. εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν — and throughout all the coasts.

Rev. T. πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν — and throughout all the country.

The presence of εἰς, "through," as in the Received Text, is attested by E, H, L, P, all the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and Chrysostom. Codices C and D are defective. The preposition is demanded by the construction, which here changes from the preceding datives to an accusative. But it was early omitted through its resemblance to the preceding syllable, — Ἱεροσολύμοις, as they appear in uncial letters, — the latter being overlooked after the copying of the former. Hence its absence from **S**, A, B, and one or two copies of the Vulgate. In any other manuscripts the omission would be recognized as an oversight, and treated accordingly.

xxvi. 28.

Rec. T. με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι. — thou persuadest me to be a Christian.

Rev. T. με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. — thou wouldst fain make me a Christian.

The common reading γενέσθαι is supported by E, H, I, P, most cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The Revisers' ποιῆσαι is attested by **S**, A, B, 13, 17, 40, 61, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic Version, Platt's Ethiopic and Cassiodorus. It must be admitted that ποιῆσαι has every appearance of being a genuine reading. It could not have been intentionally introduced in place of γενέσθαι; nor could it easily have got in otherwise if it were not genuine.

Γενέσθαι is evidently a later reading; and it seems to have crept in from the margin, where it was probably originally written in explanation of the supposed sense in which ποιῆσαι was used by the writer and should be taken by the reader, as apparently indicated in verse 29; as if Agrippa's meaning was, "Thou persuadest me *to become* a Christian." Ποιῆσαι, however, is used simply to prevent the repetition of the preceding verb πιστεύειν, "to believe," just as "to do" is often used in English, and *facere* in Latin; and the words are to be rendered, "Thou persuadest me *to do it* as a Christian"; *i.e.* to believe the prophets as Christians do, — to accept their view of the prophecies as applying to Jesus. This use of ποιεῖν is by no means uncommon. We have examples of it in Luke vi. 10, "And he *did it*," — *i.e.* stretched out his hand; 1 Tim. i. 13, "I *did it* ignorantly, — *i.e.* blasphemed and persecuted; Rev. xiii. 5, "Power (or permission) was given him *to do it* for forty and two months," — *i.e.* to blaspheme. Compare note on Mark vi. 20. — Without the word Χριστιανόν, Agrippa's answer would imply that he did not believe the prophets till persuaded to do it by Paul. This, however, was not his meaning. He simply did not previously regard the prophecies as applying to Jesus. Hence he employs Χριστιανόν, admitting that Paul had made a strong argument, and had in a measure persuaded him that the prophecies did have reference to Jesus, whom the Jews had crucified. See Note on the rendering of Acts xxvi. 28, 29, in *The Revisers' English Text*.

xxvii. 16.

Rec. T. καλούμενον Κλαύδην, — which is called Claudia.

Rev. T. καλούμενον Καῦδα, — called Cauda.

The Revisers, having changed "Clauda" to "Cauda," add the marginal note that many ancient authorities read "Clauda." The only known Greek manuscripts that read "Cauda" are **S**, as amended early in the seventh century, and B. Besides

these, the Vulgate alone reads "Cauda," or "Caude." The Peshito Syriac gives "Kura"; and Platt's Ethiopic, "Keda"; — variations that are still farther from the true reading. The received reading, "Clauda," or "Claude," is supported by **Σ** first hand, A, H, L, P, 61, and the rest of the cursives, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac in both text and margin, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic, Chrysostom, and Bede. Unless the testimony of B and the Vulgate is to be considered unimpeachable, we see no reason why we should not continue to read, with Tischendorf and the Received Text, "Clauda."

xxvii. 19.

Rec. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαμεν. — we cast out with our own hands the tackling of the ship.

Rev. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαν. — they cast out with their own hands the tackling of the ship.

The former of these readings is that of H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Platt's Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. The latter is attested by **Σ**, A, B, C, about twenty cursives, a catena, one Old Latin manuscript, the Vulgate, and the Armenian. Verses 18, 19, as given in the Revised Version, read as follows: "And as we labored exceedingly with the storm, the next day they began to throw the freight overboard; and the third day they cast out with their own hands the tackling of the ship." On reading this, one can hardly refrain from asking why it should be said that the sailors cast out the tackling *with their own hands*, especially after having been told in the previous verse that they had been engaged the day before in lightening the ship of its freight. Who *should* do it, if the ship's crew did not? And how should they do it, unless with their own hands? Why, then, this uncalled-for statement? Humphry says it was because the passengers were not called on to help them. If the text means anything, it means this just as truly without these words here

as in the previous verse. The four older uncials are assuredly astray here. One of them (B) certainly errs in the very next verse in omitting λοιπόν, "at last," when speaking of all hope as taken away. Another (A), in verse 21, improperly omits "then" before "Paul stood forth." A third (**Σ**), in verse 27, speaks of the shipmen as deeming that some country "extended before" them, προαγαγεῖν, instead of "was drawing near," προσάγειν, to them. And the fourth (C), in verse 28, says "we found" for "they found" fifteen fathoms of water. It certainly is not impossible, then, that they should be united in error here in representing Luke as saying "*they* cast out" with their own hands the tackling, — a reading into which some early scribe might easily have been betrayed by finding in the previous verse the statement that "*they* began to lighten the ship." If this accounts for the origin of the reading, and the received be accepted as the true reading, there will be no difficulty. It becomes plain enough why Luke should have said, "*We* cast out *with our own hands* the tackling." It was something not expected of passengers, especially of soldiers and their prisoners. And probably the reason why it was found necessary for them to do it was that the seamen were still engaged on that day, as on the previous day, in trying to lighten the vessel of its cargo; for we afterwards find (verse 38) that they were still at work "casting out the wheat into the sea," and lightening the ship.

xxvii. 37.

A marginal note offers the information that some ancient authorities here read "about three-score and sixteen souls," in place of the accepted reading, "two-hundred three-score and sixteen souls." The reader will observe that these authorities are not among the later uncials and the cursives; they consist of B, the oldest of all known Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and its faithful ally, the Thebaic, one of the early versions,

— these two, and only these. Epiphanius, who probably could not see the point or the propriety of saying "*about* seventy-six," says, as most persons would naturally say, "about seventy." Westcott and Hort adopt this unique reading, "about" seventy-six, and place the "two hundred," which appears in all the other documents, in the margin opposite $\omega\varsigma$, "about," as a secondary reading. Hence the artless note in the Revisers' margin. But though "about" has the "authority" of the Vatican manuscript, the Thebaic Version, and Epiphanius, it is but the result of an obvious blunder. Some early transcriber was copying from an exemplar in which $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\pi\lambda\acute{o}\iota\psi$, "the ship," stood immediately before the numeral, as it does in $\aleph$, A, B, C, and a number of cursives, and not before $\alpha\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$, "all the souls," as in the Received and Revised Texts. On coming to $\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, the abridged Greek form of writing "two-hundred and seventy-six," corresponding to our 276, he evidently connected the σ of $\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ with the last letter of the preceding word, which was inadvertently repeated by him, as was common; and so he changed the reading to $\omega\varsigma$ $\omicron\varsigma$, *i.e.* "about seventy-six." It was simply a blunder, and later copyists generally had the discernment to see it. And if certain modern editors were not infatuated with an apparently superstitious reverence for B, Bible-readers at this late day would not be introduced to that palpably impossible reading, "*about* seventy-six souls." The American Committee of Revisers very properly omit this note.

xxvii. 39.

Again some ancient authorities are said to read "bring the ship safe to shore" in place of "beach the ship" or "drive the ship ashore." That is, they read $\epsilon\kappa\omega\acute{\sigma}\alpha\iota$ instead of $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$, — the two words having almost the same sound; so that it is no wonder if, especially in copying from dictation, the former word should have crept into a few copies. It is so given, however, only by B first hand, C, and the Memphitic and Arme-

nian Versions. Persons in the perilous condition in which these sailors were, usually think more of saving themselves than of anything else. They care but little as to what becomes of the vessel if they themselves can only reach the land in safety. In this respect, these seamen do not appear, from verse 30, to have been very different from other men. The idea of saving the ship probably did not enter their minds. Their one thought was how best to save themselves and what little they had left. Hence, as Luke tells us, "they determined, if they could, to beach the ship." The other reading will do to go along with "about seventy-six."

xxvii. 41.

Rec. T. $\text{ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων}$, — with the violence of the waves.

Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῆς βίας , — by the violence of the waves.

Though the Revisers omit $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, in accordance with the reading of $\aleph$ first hand, A, B, unsupported by any other uncial, or by a single cursive, or version, or patristic writer, they have given us, in italics, the corresponding English words, "of the waves." And this is revision. After omitting $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ so as to present the genuine Greek Text as the necessary proper basis for the revision of the English Version, it does seem as if, for the sake of consistency, they would have kept from adding in English the words "of the waves." But the trouble is, they have adopted a false Greek Text, by which it is impossible for any version to abide. Amidst the fourfold occurrences of the syllable $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ immediately after $\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, "violence," some early scribe unquestionably lost himself. Having written the first $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$, on casting his eye back to his exemplar, he caught sight of the third instead of the first, from which he evidently passed on in perfect unconsciousness of having omitted the two preceding words, $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. If the reading which the Revisers have adopted had been the reading of Luke, a glossarist, as Meyer forcibly remarks, would more

naturally have written on the margin τῆς θαλάσσης, "of the sea," than τῶν κυμάτων. The former occurs repeatedly in this connection, but the latter does not occur again in the whole book of Acts. In support of τῶν κυμάτων as a part of the original text, we have **S** as amended early in the seventh century, C (D is defective), H, L, P, all the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Platt's Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. In view of all the circumstances, it really seems as if a candid inquirer after the truth, who is at all qualified to sit in judgment in the case, ought to be satisfied that the Greek for "of the waves" is a genuine portion of the text. The Revisers, however, have only followed others.

xxviii. 1.

Another marginal note says that some ancient documents read "Melitene" here instead of "Melita" or "Melite." This is a vitiation of the text, the only known ancient supporters of which are B first hand (though this is changed to *Melite* by what Tischendorf thought might be the contemporary Reviser's hand), a lectionary, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Armenian Version. Besides these, three manuscripts of the Vulgate read *Militene*; Jerome has either *Militine* or *Miletene*; the Memphitic Version, *Meletine*; and Platt's Ethiopic, *Malajat*. These variations, by the unsettled character of their orthography, do not tend to establish the genuineness of the reading. In fact, there can hardly be any doubt as to its spuriousness or its origin. Where Luke wrote Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος, or rather ΜΕΛΙΤΗΗΗΗCOC, some tired or careless copyist, becoming confused among the letters of like or similar form, and very possibly more or less confounding the first of these words with the familiar name Μιτυλήνη (Mitylene), annexed the first syllable of νῆσος to Μελίτη, and wrote instead ΜΕΛΙΤΗΗΗΗΗCOC, or Μελιτήνη ἡ νῆσος. It was a mistake, unconsciously made and easily to be accounted for, and

was seen to be such by the Reviser of B, who at once corrected it. But because it appears in B, and is endorsed by a few versions, Westcott and Hort adopt it without comment! Hence this marginal note. But the common reading of the text, which is adopted by all other modern editors, is sufficiently attested by **S**, A, B third hand if not second, C, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Clementine Vulgate, one manuscript of Jerome's, and Chrysostom.

xxviii. 13.

Here the marginal note says some ancient authorities read, "cast loose," instead of "fetched a compass," or "made a circuit." Only **S** first hand, and B read thus. If περιελόντες can really mean "having cast loose," it implies that the vessel had been moored or tied up to a wharf. There is nothing in the narrative to indicate that this may not have been the case. The vessel was detained at Syracuse three days. If this detention was in order to discharge a part of the cargo, or to take on more, the ship might have been fastened to a mole or pier. If it was on account of the unfavorable wind, the vessel would more probably have been anchored in the bay. The general course from Malta to Putcoli, through the Strait of Messina, on the east side of which Rhegium lay, is northerly. From the use of καταχθέντες, "touching," coming to land, or lying by, at Syracuse, as well as from the delay of three days, we may infer that the ship lay at anchor in the bay on account of an unfavorable wind. She could easily come from Malta to Syracuse with a west wind. But, under the high, mountainous range of Etna, which skirts the eastern coast of Sicily, it is impossible, with a west wind, to make any headway northward along that coast, except by rowing. The only way is to put to sea in an easterly or northeasterly course from Syracuse, until a vessel is fairly out from under the lee of the mountain range, then tack about, and run in a northwesterly course toward the strait. After

having waited in the harbor for three days, and still finding the wind blowing from the west, the captain seems to have determined to wait no longer, but to put to sea, and take this roundabout course, *περιελθόντες*; and so they "arrived at Rhegium." This reading, which is the only probable one, is attested by **Σ** as amended early in the seventh century, and all the other uncials except B, by all the cursives, and all the ancient versions. It is adopted, too, by all modern editors except Westcott and Hort. The other reading, which properly means "having taken away," and which is altogether unsuited to the connection, differs from this only in the omission of a single letter. It looks as if an ancient scribe, not understanding the meaning or seeing the applicableness of *περιελθόντες*, and remembering that in the preceding chapter a similar word is used, considered the obscure term an erroneous reading, and by omitting one letter, changed it to make it correspond with the word found in xxvii. 40. And the fact that this reading is confined to these two kindred manuscripts, though afterwards corrected in one of them, confirms us in this position.

xxviii. 16.

The Revisers omit "the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard; but." These words are not in **Σ**, A, B, I, 61, and three other cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic, or Chrysostom. They appear, however, in H, L, P, 137, and nearly all the other cursives, a catena, Theophylact in both commentaries, as well as in the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version. They are generally considered an interpolation; and possibly they are. But they may have been early omitted and for a while rejected, as embodying irrelevant matter, having no special connection with the immediate subject of Luke's narrative. Yet they have every appearance of being genuine. After having referred to other prisoners than Paul (xxviii. 1, 42), it

is but natural that Luke should state in a word what befell them as well as Paul on their joint-arrival at Rome. There are no various readings here, as there generally are in interpolated passages. And perhaps a still stronger evidence of genuineness is the presence of the article (*τῷ*) in connection with *στρατοπεδάρχῃ*, "*the* commander of the prætorian cohorts." Originally, the command of the emperor's body-guard was shared by *two* prefects. But, during the reign of Claudius, Burrus Afranius was appointed sole commander; and he continued to hold this position till the spring of A.D. 62. On his death, the command was again divided, as before, between two prefects. Now Paul arrived in Rome as a prisoner early in the spring of A.D. 61, or 62 at the very latest. So that Burrus must have been the captain of the guard to whom the prisoners were delivered. No one but Luke, however, in introducing a statement of this kind, would have been likely to keep so close to the truth of history. An interpolator would in all probability have said that the centurion delivered the prisoners either to "*the captains* of the guard," or to "*a* captain of the guard," — "*the captain*" implying that there was but one, which is not in accordance with the well-known general history concerning the command of this guard. It can hardly be argued with justice that the article here denotes simply the captain of the guard to whom this matter was assigned, or whose duty it was (possibly for that day) to receive prisoners. The command of the emperor's body-guard was an office in which, when there were two commanders, each shared the duties and responsibilities alike. Compare, for example, the following sentence: "The State Treasurer turned over to *the select-man* of the town of Utopia the funds voted by the Legislature for the relief of its sufferers." It would hardly be said that that meant "the select-man whose duty it was to receive those funds," unless there was something in the context or circumstances mentioned that plainly implied this. It would rather be understood to mean that there was but one select-man for that town, at that time at least.

ROMANS.

i. 24.

Rec. T. *ἐαυτοῖς* — themselves.Rev. T. *αὐτοῖς* — themselves.

The manuscripts that support the shorter form of this word are **N**, A, B, C, D first hand, and ten cursives. The common form is given by D third hand, E, G, K, L, P, the rest of the cursives, Origen, Didymus, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The word is, no doubt, the reflexive. If it had been really necessary to substitute the shorter for the longer form, the rough breathing ought to have been employed also; for the Revisers have translated it as a reflexive; and, among the old manuscripts, which have neither breathings nor accents, the reflexive is repeatedly written in this form. The change, especially the transforming of it into a personal pronoun, can in no sense be called necessary to the revision of the English text. Compare Note on 1 John v. 18.

ii. 14.

Rec. T. *ποιῇ* — do.Rev. T. *ποιῶσιν* — do.

The change from the singular to the plural is in accordance with the reading of **N**, A, B, half a dozen cursives, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and John Damascene; but it is neither sustained nor favored by the apostle's general use of verbs in connection with neuter plural nominatives. In the course of his epistles, he employs verbs with neuter plural subjects, at

least ninety times. Three of these are in the future;¹ and these futures are all in the plural. But they are quoted from the Septuagint.² Four are in the imperfect. These, on the other hand, are in the singular; for in 1 Cor. x. 11, the true reading is undoubtedly that of **N**, B, C, K, L, twelve or more cursives, and several Fathers, *τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν*, which is adopted by Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, and for the adoption of which there are stronger reasons than can be found for the adoption of the plural here.³ Seven of these verbs are in the perfect, all of which are in the singular. Twenty are in the aorist; and of these, only two are in the plural, and they can be easily accounted for. In Rom. xv. 27, the verb is plural because of the connection in which it stands. The idea of plurality evidently prevailed in the apostle's mind throughout the passage, and led instinctively to the plural form in both the verbs connected — the one directly, and the other indirectly — with the neuter plural subject. Hence, he naturally, if not necessarily, wrote *εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινῶνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργήσαι αὐτοῖς*, "If the Gentiles have been made partakers of their [Hebrew Christians'] spiritual things, they [Gentile Christians] ought also to minister to them in carnal things." In 1 Cor. x. 6, the other instance in which the apostle employs the aorist in the plural, *ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ὑμῶν ἐγενήθησαν*, "Now these things were our examples," — taking this to be the true construction, — the verb is similarly drawn into the plural by the plural predicate nominative *τύποι*. But we are inclined to think that the true construction here requires us to take *ταῦτα* adverbially, and not as a nominative. In that case, the real subject of this, as of the preceding, verb is *αὐτοί* understood; and the meaning is, "And in these respects (*i.e.* the two points mentioned in the preceding verse) they became examples (of warning)

¹ Rom. xv. 12; Gal. iii. 8; Heb. i. 12.² Isa. xlii. 4; Gen. xviii. 18; xxii. 18; Ps. (ci. 28, or) cii. 27.³ See Note on 1 Cor. x. 11.

for us." In one other instance (2 Tim. iv. 17), Tregelles and the Revisers give the verb in the singular, in accordance with the common reading; but Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, following $\aleph$, A, C, D, E, F, G, P, 17, and ten other cursives, read *ακούσωσιν*. In the remaining fifty-six instances, the verbs are in the present. In two or three of these, the manuscripts are more or less divided; but the singular is commonly adopted. In only two of all the other instances, apart from the passage before us, is the plural unquestioningly admitted; namely, 1 Cor. xii. 25, and xiv. 10. In both these, as in the case of the plural aorists already noticed, the immediate context undoubtedly lent its influence in causing the verbs to be in the plural. This may have been the case here, — the plural *οἱτοί*, following on immediately after the verb, and at the same time representing the more remote *ἔθνη*, may have caused the apostle to use the plural *ποιῶσιν* instead of the common singular form. It may be added that in no other instance, unless it be Gal. v. 17, *ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται*, "these things are contrary to each other," where L, from fifteen to twenty cursives, John Damascene, and Theophylact employ the plural, does this disturbing influence in any degree appear. Neither the construction nor the meaning is in the least affected by the change which the Revisers have made; and, as it was in no wise essential to the attainment of the end for which they were chosen, perhaps it would have been as well to have left the Greek unchanged here, as it was in 1 Tim. v. 25, and 2 Tim. iv. 17.

iii. 2.

Rec. T. *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν* — chiefly, because that unto them were committed.

Rev. T. *πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν* — first of all, that they were entrusted with.

The Revisers, in omitting *γάρ*, have followed B, D first hand, E, G, five cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Mem-

phitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Origen as represented by his Latin interpreter, and Ambrosiaster. The omission has the appearance of an endeavor to free the sentence from an apparently superfluous element. It is hard to account for the presence of *γάρ* on the supposition that it is not genuine. The common but more difficult reading is the more strongly attested. It has the support of $\aleph$, A, D third hand, K, L, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Euthalius, Photius, Theophylact, and Ecumenius. King James's Revisers evidently did not know what to do with *γάρ*. They made it introduce a reason for saying "chiefly," or "first of all." Its true use, however, is to introduce a reason for saying "much every way," with special reference to the word "much." But that reason is implied rather than given. Fully expressed, it would be *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὸ περισσὸν ἐστὶν ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*; literally, "for, in the first place assuredly, they have the advantage that they were entrusted," etc.; or briefly, "for, first of all, they were entrusted with the oracles of God." On account of the ellipsis, *ὅτι* does not need to be translated, as *γάρ* itself often does not after *ἀλλά*, "but," when the clause which the latter impliedly introduces is unexpressed.¹

iii. 22.

Rec. T. *εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας* — unto all and upon all them that believe.

Rev. T. *εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας* — unto all them that believe.

The omission of the words rendered "and upon all" is supported by $\aleph$ first hand, A, B, C, P, 47 first hand, 137, the Memphitic, Armenian, and both Ethiopic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Cyril, and Augustine. Origen also may be said

¹ Compare *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ περαινεν ἡδὴ ὥρα*, "But it is now high time to conclude." Literally, "But (I will say no more), for indeed it is already time to come to a conclusion." — *Xen. Anab.* III., ii. 32.

to favor this reading, though, instead of quoting the verse, he links together parts of this and the preceding verse. In other words, he cites what suits his purpose, and in so doing does not give the words "and upon all." At the same time, these words are called for by **Σ** as amended early in the seventh century, D, E, F, G, K, L, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, one manuscript of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. There is no apparent reason why they should have been added, if not genuine. The sentence is not any more incomplete without them than with them. Nor is there anything that seems to demand their insertion by a glossarist. So far, then, transcriptional probability favors the presence of the expression. On the other hand, it is by no means strange that the words, if genuine, should have been omitted. Their absence in some documents may be due to the common transcriptional error of *homoioteleuton*,—the transcriber's eye having gone from the first πάντας to the second, and so caused him to overlook the intervening words. Or they may have been intentionally omitted from having been considered redundant, apparently a mere repetition of the preceding phrase. The fact that several copies of the Vulgate and John Damascene retain the latter phrase while they omit the former, rather strengthens this belief. It must be borne in mind, too, that the reverence paid by second- and third-century transcribers to the apostolic writings, as Dr. Hort says, "was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance," and that "the Epistles bear abundant traces" of this laxity on their part.¹ Besides, the accumulation of prepositions with the same object, so far from being contrary to the apostle's habit of speaking, is in perfect accordance with it. Witness chapter xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Eph. iv. 6; Col. i. 16. So here, in the double phrase εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ

¹ *Introduction to New Testament in Greek*, p. 7.

πάντας, he refers to the righteousness that is accounted to believers as coming "unto all" and being "for all" that believe, whether Jews or Gentiles, "for there is no difference" between them before God. We are constrained therefore to consider the omitted words, though not contained in some ancient documents, as a genuine reading, fully sustained by internal evidence, as well as supported from without.

iv. 19.

Rec. T. οὐ κατένόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered not his own body.

Rev. T. κατένόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered his own body.

The common reading is attested by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin Versions *d, e, f, g*, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen twice, Chrysostom according to one edition, Epiphanius, the Paschal Chronicle, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and Ambrosiaster. It is what Dr. Hort is pleased to call "a Western reading."¹ The Revisers omit οὐ in accordance with the testimony of **Σ**, A, B, C, 67 second hand, 93, 137, two copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, Erpenius' Arabic Version, John Damascene, and apparently Origen and Chrysostom in other places. It is thus strongly supported by the oldest known documents. And it yields what many consider an excellent meaning; namely, that Abraham fully recognized his own condition, but was not staggered thereby. Still, we cannot but regard it as a false reading. Let us look at the real meaning of the original. The Revisers' Greek does not mean, as their rendering indicates it does, that Abraham considered his own body as good as dead, etc., "without being weakened" in faith thereby. In other words, the verb ἀσθενεῖν does not mean "to be weakened," but "to be weak." By giving ἀσθενήσας, "being weak," its proper

¹ *Introduction*, etc., p. 124.

signification and omitting the second negative as the Revisers have done, the reasoning will not be found to be very forcible or altogether conclusive: "And as he was not weak in faith, he considered his own body now as good as dead (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb; but, looking unto the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief." The question arises, Why should it be said that he considered his own body as good as dead, etc., if he was strong in faith? What is the pertinence of saying that, as he was not weak in faith, he considered his own and his wife's infirmities, etc.? It will not do to introduce, with Buttmann,¹ the particle *μέν* in connection with the verb, and read, "He *considered indeed* his own and Sarah's condition, but nevertheless he wavered not." The apostle, it is true, is somewhat loose in his use of *μέν* as compared with classical writers; but in a case like this, where the presence of the particle is essential if the negative is not employed, the omission of *μέν* is an offence of which, we can safely say, he could not have been guilty. To insert it here would be to make Greek for him instead of making English out of his Greek. The only satisfactory reading of the sentence is obtained by restoring the negative which the Revisers have omitted. This makes the apostle say, beginning with verse 18: Abraham against hope hopefully believed that he would become the father of many nations, according to what had been told him; namely, So shall thy seed be. And, as he was not weak in faith, he did not take into account [the condition of] *his own* body, — that having already lost its power of procreation, he being about a hundred years old, — or the deadness of *Sarah's* womb; but depending upon the promise of God, so far from wavering in unbelief, he was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God, etc. The point is, that, being strong in faith, he *did not* really consider his own and Sarah's condition any obstacle in the way of their having a posterity;

¹ *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 356.

but, on the contrary, he believed that God would make good his promise, and confidently left it with him to do it. The whole drift and the very point of the apostle's argument show that he must have used two negatives, — "*not* weak in faith," "*did not* consider." But the second of these was evidently early omitted from the text by some meddling hand, perhaps under the idea that it was inconsistent with the statement given in Gen. xvii. 17; whereas, the true reference of the apostle is to Gen. xv. 5, 6. — Compare Meyer on the passage.

V. 1.

Rec. T. εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν — we have peace with God.

Rev. T. εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν — let us have peace with God.

The received reading here, which is that adopted by the American Committee of N. T. Revisers, is supported by *Σ*'s contemporary "proof reader," B third hand, F, G, P, most of the cursives, and a few of the Fathers. The Canterbury Revisers' reading is that of the scribe of *Σ*, A, B first hand, C, D, E, K, L, between thirty and forty cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, F, G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and both forms of the Ethiopic Version. It is also supported by Origen, Titus of Bostra, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. External evidence therefore is greatly in favor of the Canterbury reading.

This reading, however, is entirely unsuitable to the context, which is not hortatory but doctrinal and didactic. So far from being hortatory, the verse introduces the conclusion at which the apostle has now arrived. This is obvious from the word "therefore," with which the chapter opens, and by which it is connected with what precedes. Having concluded the foregoing argument, the apostle goes on to show that, having been justified by faith, believers *have peace* with God. They are no longer regarded by him as enemies; they have been placed on

a footing of reconciliation and peace with him through Jesus Christ. It is a truth which his readers needed to know in order to understand their true relations to God as believers in Jesus. But suppose we take the verse as an exhortation: "Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This implies two things. In the first place, it implies what is not true; namely, that those who are justified do not necessarily have peace with God. It ignores the very point which the apostle makes; and that is, that they have peace with God because of their having been justified by him. It implies also that there may be some other way of being at peace with him than through Christ, though the apostle would have his readers seek only that peace with God which is to be had through Christ. Both of these views, however, are antagonistic to the apostle's belief and teaching, and consequently cannot be involved in his language. His words are not "Let us have *the peace of God*"; that is, the inward consciousness of security which God imparts to believers. This would be a proper subject of exhortation; but the other is not. Peace with God is the necessary consequence of justification. A believer may not be conscious of it; but this does not affect the truth that he has peace with God, and has it as a believer in Christ. The Greek subjunctive or English imperative, therefore, calling upon him to have peace with God, is manifestly out of place.

But this is not all. Intrinsic probability is still farther opposed to this reading. Peace with God is not obtained by being sought. It follows as an immediate and necessary result of justification. The believer in Christ is one against whom God has no claims for punishment. God loves and deals with him as a child for whom only grace and goodness are in store. How then can believers, those who are already at peace with God through Jesus Christ, be reasonably exhorted to have this peace? There is not in all the New Testament an exhortation to this effect. And to suppose the apostle to have been capa-

ble of exhorting his readers as justified persons to have peace with God through Jesus Christ is simply to consider him unacquainted with the subject of which he was speaking. For him to have done it would have been a moral impossibility. And yet the five oldest manuscripts represent him as having done it. The erroneous reading—for it is nothing else—originated in simply mistaking $\omicron$ for ω , an error of common occurrence among ancient manuscripts. The same itacism appears among several of them in 1 Cor. xv. 49, making the apostle say, "*Let us bear* the image of the heavenly."¹ The Revisers, however, in their text, very properly read the indicative, "we shall bear," notwithstanding that four of the five great uncials, together with other manuscripts, have the subjunctive. An exhortation to bear the image of the heavenly would, however, be no more out of place there, or out of harmony with the context, than is the exhortation to believers to have peace with God through their Lord Jesus Christ. The opposite error of writing $\omicron$ for ω is also occasionally found in the best manuscripts. Thus, in Rom. xiv. 19, $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ appears in $\aleph$, A, B, F, G, L, P, etc., instead of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$.² Yet the Re-

¹ The following are a few other instances. In Rom. v. 10, Codex L and a few cursives have $\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, "we should be saved," for $\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, "we shall be saved," though in the preceding verse they give the word correctly, in the future indicative. In 1 Cor. xiv. 15, where the Received Text reads, with B, K, L, 17, 37, and the great body of the cursives, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "I will pray with the spirit, and will pray," etc., A, D, E, F, G, P, and three cursives read $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$. . . $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "Let me pray with the spirit, and let me pray," etc., while the Sinaitic Codex reads $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$. . . $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "Let me pray with the spirit, and I will pray," etc. On this, Principal Edwards says (*Commentary on 1 Corinthians*), "The future indicative yields a meaning so much more satisfactory that it must be accepted. . . . The best manuscripts often confound $\omicron$ with ω . If it were hortatory, we should have expected the plural." But he says nothing of the peculiar reading of the Sinaitic Codex, which virtually makes the apostle say, "If I can only pray with the spirit, I will pray with the understanding also."

² In the first verse of chapter vi. $\aleph$, K, P, a number of cursives, and the

visers, in this case, discard the testimony of these manuscripts, and following what are commonly considered less trustworthy witnesses read, as does the Received Text, "*Let us follow* after things that make for peace." Still, they deem it necessary to say in the margin, "Many ancient authorities read *we follow*," even though it is evidently a false reading. Prebendary Humphry seeks to justify the reading "Let us have peace with God" by a reference to Heb. xii. 28. But the two cases are by no means parallel. The former is out of harmony with the context, and is really an incredible reading; whereas the exhortation to have a thankful heart or to be thankful is perfectly natural and legitimate, and accords with the context.

If there is anything that should put the textual critic on his guard against an over-confidence in the old manuscripts, it is the fact of the existence among them of errors such as these. They reveal, on the part of copyists, not merely carelessness, but ignorance of the first principles of Christian experience, and a lack of heart to enter into the meaning of the sacred writers, in some of their utterances at least.

V. 2.

The ancient authorities referred to in the marginal note as omitting "by faith" are B, D, E, F, G, the Roman Ethiopic Version, and Origen in two instances. But the genuineness of the words is attested by Σ first hand, C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Origen in two other

Memphitic Version read the present indicative *ἐπιμένωμεν*, "we continue," for the present subjunctive *ἐπιμένωμεν*, "let us continue." In viii. 26, D, K, L, P, more than seventy cursives, and several of the Fathers, including Origen, have the future indicative *προσευξόμεθα*, "we shall pray," instead of the aorist subjunctive *προσευξώμεθα*, "we should pray." Also, in Heb. xii. 28, Σ , K, P, 31, and many other cursives have *ἔχομεν*, "we have," for *ἔχωμεν*, "let us have."

instances, Chrysostom once, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others; as well as by the reading, *ἐν τῇ πίστει* (in Σ as amended by its contemporary reviser, A, 93, 124, Titus of Bostra, and Chrysostom in the same connection as before), which is simply the true reading with the final letters of the preceding *ἐσχάται* EN repeated and prefixed. Griesbach and Tischendorf, as well as the Revisers, retain the words. But Lachmann rejects them, Westcott and Hort bracket them, and Tregelles questions their genuineness. But the fact that they may be omitted without injury to the sense is presumptive evidence not only that they are a part of the original text, but that they were really omitted in a few copies as superfluous.

V. 6.

Rec. T. *κατὰ καιρόν* — in due time.

Rev. T. *ἔτι κατὰ καιρόν* — in due season.

By adopting this reading, the Revisers repeat *ἔτι*, but do not translate it. Nor can it be translated without letting *ἔτι* in the beginning of the verse go untranslated. The word is repeated in Σ , A, C, D first hand, two cursives, Epiphanius, and John Damascene. But it was evidently introduced here by some early scribe, who, having associated it with *ἀσθενῶν*, the meaning of which is modified by it, carried it along in his mind, and inserted it after this word, not realizing that he had already written it in its proper place. Afterwards, certain transcribers, as those of Σ , A, C, D, and others, in the mechanical performance of their duty, allowed both readings to remain, apparently without questioning their propriety. But the scribe of B, or one of his predecessors, was evidently perplexed by this double use of *ἔτι*. In his quandary, he took the second to be the true reading, inasmuch as it stood in immediate connection with the word to be modified by it. But he changed *ἔτι γάρ*, in the beginning of the verse, to *εἰ γέ*, "if indeed," a reading found elsewhere only in Westcott and Hort, to

which Dr. Hort, for himself, adds the note, "But εἰ περ [for which there is no authority whatever] would better explain all the variations, and be equally appropriate."¹ Other scribes and translators, most of them retaining, like B, the second εἰ, changed εἰ γάρ somewhat differently. The Peshito Syriac Version transformed it to εἰ δέ, "and if." One cursive, the original text of the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate, Isidore of Pelusium, and Augustine read εἰ γάρ, "for if." The Memphitic Version has "for if yet." D as amended at an early date, F, G, the Vulgate generally, and a few Latin witnesses read εἰς τί γάρ, *ut quid enim*, "for why." "The misplacement of the εἰ [i.e. its insertion after ἀσθενῶν] came to predominate because a church-lesson began with Χριστός."—*Meyer*. This misplacement is given as genuine by S, A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, two cursives, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, possibly Irenæus, Epiphanius, and John Damascene. But it is omitted by D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, both forms of the Ethiopic, and Origen twice. In view of all this evidence, internal and external, the second εἰ must be considered no part of the original reading. Its insertion in any modern Greek text of the New Testament is but a servile acceptance of the testimony of a few old manuscripts as authoritative, even though they present as the true reading a palpable error that is easily accounted for, and that makes an untranslatable combination of words.

V. 17.

The marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit *of the gift*," is hardly worthy of a place here, the omission being found in no manuscript but B, and the cursive 49. Irenæus gives the passage once, and Origen twice, without the phrase, as do Chrysostom and Augustine. But they evidently regarded

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 108.

"of the gift" and "of righteousness" as synonymous, either of which, in their view, expressed the apostle's meaning without the other. Hence Origen, after quoting the passage twice without τῆς δωρεᾶς, three pages further on quotes it with these words but without τῆς δικαιοσύνης. The scribe of B, or perhaps some preceding scribe, in all probability took the same view, omitting "of the gift," while the scribe of C and the copyist of 70, taking the same view, retained "of the gift," but rejected "of righteousness." The omission of τῆς δωρεᾶς in B is simply one of those abbreviated forms of speech that abound in the Vatican Codex, and is no more worthy of notice than is C's omission of τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Three other examples of a similar nature occur in B in this very chapter; namely, the omission of ὁ Θεός in verse 8, of χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ in verse 11, and of καί, "also," after οὕτω, "so," in verse 15. In all these instances of omission in B, except that of ὁ Θεός, verse 8, the omitted word or words have been bracketed by Westcott and Hort as of somewhat questionable genuineness; though, for the same reason ὁ Θεός might have been bracketed as well as the others. The Revisers, however, have no marginal notes acquainting the reader of these omissions, nor of the omission of τῆς δικαιοσύνης by C, 70 first hand, and Origen; though all of them deserve it quite as much as the one noted by them.

vii. 23.

Rec. T. αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ — bringing me into captivity to the law.

Rev. T. αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ — bringing me into captivity under the law.

The Revisers' Text, understood as rendered by them, presents a harsh and unnatural construction; for the verb itself means "to bring under control," "to subdue," and, in circumstances like this, calls for a dative. If ἐν is properly employed here, the only legitimate construction is that of the instrumental dative: "bringing me into captivity *by means of* (or *through*)

the law of sin"; as Theodoret and others who adopt this reading understand it. But Paul can hardly be supposed to have said, "I see a different *law in my members* warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity *through the law of sin which is in my members*." An ignorant scribe or annotator, however, not being able otherwise to understand the apostle, would very naturally have inserted *ἐν*, or written it upon the margin, to aid the construction, or to explain the meaning. Its presence is attested by what might ordinarily be regarded a tolerably strong group of uncials, — **Σ**, B, D, E, F, G, K, P. But when we look at some of the readings presented by B in the immediate context, our confidence in its testimony here is shaken, and we fear that the rest of the group have also been betrayed into giving false testimony. In only the preceding verse, for example, B stands alone in reading τοῦ νοός, "of my mind," for τοῦ Θεοῦ, "of God." Again, four verses farther on (viii. 2), **Σ**, B, F, G, unite in giving what Dr. Hort pronounces "a very unlikely reading"; namely, *σε* for *με*, *i.e.* "thee" for "me," after ἐλευθέρωσε, "freed." With such obvious errors in the Vatican manuscript so close at hand, we may be pardoned if we place very little confidence in its testimony in upholding *ἐν* as a genuine reading. The common reading is supported by A, C, L, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and several Fathers. It has also every appearance of being genuine, — which is more than can be said of the Revisers' reading.

viii. 11.

It has long been a question which of the two readings is the true one, — that of the text, "by" or "through" his Spirit, or that of the margin, "because of" his Spirit. The former is attested by **Σ**, A, C, P second hand, less than twenty cursives, the Memphitic, Woide's Thebaic, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Portus, Athanasius, Didymus, Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrys-

ostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Macarius, John Damascene, and others. The latter is vouched for by B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P first hand, about seventy cursives, Mai's Extracts,¹ the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic according to Griesbach, Origen again and again, Irenæus, Methodius according to Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Euthalius, Severianus, Tertullian, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, and many others. But the question cannot really be decided by documentary evidence alone. This is about equally divided. Internal evidence is altogether in favor of the marginal reading, — "on account of his Spirit." The New Testament nowhere teaches that the "quickening" of our mortal bodies at the resurrection is to be effected through the agency of the Holy Spirit, as the reading of the text would lead one to suppose it is to be.² It is everywhere "God who quickeneth the dead" through our Lord Jesus Christ.³ And it is because believers are Christ's that they are to be raised from the dead, and endued with immortal bodies. In other words, it is *because of the Spirit of God that dwells in them*. Hence, with the attestation which this reading has, we need not hesitate to adopt it as the true reading. Its teaching is that God, who restored to life him in whom dwelt the *fulness* of the Spirit, will in due time bring out from among the dead the bodies of believers, because of their being endued with the same Spirit.

¹ A compilation (*m*) of New Testament readings extracted by Cardinal Angelo Mai, 1843, from the *Speculum*, a Latin work ascribed to Augustine.

² Jesus indeed says, John vi. 63, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." There is no allusion here, however, to the resurrection. Christ refers simply to the life-giving principle in man in distinction from the substance of his body. His meaning is, The spirit is that which animates the body, not the body that which animates the spirit. For this purpose the body, "the flesh," is of no account. To this animating principle in man he likens his own words: they are an animating principle, they are the source of spiritual life. Compare 1 Pet. iii. 18, R. V.

³ See John v. 21; vi. 39; xi. 25; Rom. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45, 57; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Eph. i. 10, 19, 20; 1 Thess. iv. 14, 16.

viii. 24.

Rec. T. $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\varsigma, \tau\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$; — for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

Rev. T. $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota, \tau\iota\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$; — for who hopeth for that which he seeth?

The Revisers have adopted, with Westcott and Hort, a reading found only in B first hand, and on the margin of the eleventh- or twelfth-century cursive 47, — testimony in itself very far from being conclusive, or even of preponderant weight. Had this been the original reading, it seems impossible that the other should have crowded it out of every known document but two, especially when we consider that, on the supposition that it is genuine, it is difficult to see how the other could have got into the text. The reading is not only improbable; it is not in strict harmony with the context. It seems to be one of B's abbreviated forms, partially corrected, almost as soon as made, by the insertion of $\tau\acute{\iota}$ after $\tau\iota\varsigma$. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ was evidently dropped as superfluous, because the apostle's words were misunderstood, — $\tau\iota\varsigma$ having been taken interrogatively, and the question supposed to mean, "For who also hopes for what he sees?" This was the first step, leaving the text as given by only two hands, the original scribes of $\aleph$ and 47. But $\kappa\alpha\iota$ also was felt by others to be unnecessary. Hence its omission in B, and its removal, at least eight centuries afterwards, from Codex 47, by some reader who probably was able to compare that manuscript with B, and consequently noted on its margin, "Anciently it read thus"; *i.e.* without $\tau\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota$. But, while $\kappa\alpha\iota$ was thought by many to be needless, $\tau\acute{\iota}$ was restored in B by its contemporary reviser, and retained by the scribes of D, F, G, and their Latin translators; also by the translators of the Vulgate and the Peshito Syriac, and by Origen, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, and others, — all of whom omitted the $\kappa\alpha\iota$. The true reading is, no doubt, that of the Received Text, which is attested by $\aleph$'s seventh-century corrector, A, C, K, L, P, nearly every cursive,

the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Clement, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John Damascene; and virtually, also, by B as corrected by its early reviser, D, F, G, and the other witnesses that retain $\tau\acute{\iota}$, though they omit $\kappa\alpha\iota$, — the omission of this word not materially affecting the apostle's thought, which centres on the hope itself, not on the person who may be indulging it, as the Revisers' reading evidently makes it.

viii. 35.

The marginal note, stating that some ancient authorities read "of God" where the text reads "of Christ," would be more satisfactory if it stated the facts in the case. The Sinaitic manuscript, seven cursives, a lectionary of the Latin Vulgate, together with Origen, Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, Hilary, Jerome, Epiphanius, and others read "of God"; — some of these Fathers giving this reading repeatedly. But the Vatican Codex alone of all the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, reads "of God which is in Christ Jesus," — a reading evidently taken from verse 39 by some ancient copyist who regarded the words "the love of Christ" as conflicting with the expression "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus," and so changed the former to correspond with the latter. Origen, in two out of his ten or more citations of this passage, also gives the reading, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus"; while in another place he gives the whole expression as it stands in verse 39, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." The previously mentioned witnesses, however, were satisfied with substituting simply, "of God," for "of Christ," as that sufficed to obviate the supposed difficulty. The reading really deserves no notice. Westcott and Hort, however, insert it in their margin, on the principle, we presume, that no readings of $\aleph$, B, can safely be rejected absolutely.

viii. 38.

Rec. T. οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα — nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come.

Rev. T. οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις — nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers.

The reading of the Revisers is strongly supported by documentary evidence, — the common reading having only the attestation of K, L, the cursives as a body, the Peshito Syriac, the Gothic, and a few Fathers, — Chrysostom several times. But the truth is, that the documents indicate early and great confusion among copyists, translators, and others, in the giving of this verse, — some transposing, some adding to, some taking from, and some otherwise changing, the terms given by the apostle. The reading seems to have originated with an early copyist, in omitting δυνάμεις οὔτε by *homoioteleuton*. Some one, afterwards observing the omission, probably placed οὔτε δυνάμεις in the margin, whence the words were transferred to the text, but put in the wrong place. That *the apostle* should have made this arrangement is incredible. His mind was one that grouped objects together naturally. This is obvious everywhere. Hence we may be assured that he could not have inserted "powers" between "things to come" and "height," with neither of which it has any affinity in thought. Again, ἀρχαί, in the sense of principalities, is a word which he nowhere else uses alone. He generally couples it with ἐξουσία, "powers," as in Eph. iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; ii. 15; Tit. iii. 1. In 1 Cor. xv. 24 and Eph. i. 21, he uses the singular in connection with both ἐξουσία and δύναμις. It is hardly possible, therefore, for him to have used δυνάμεις in this connection without coupling it with ἀρχαί. This constrains us to believe that its true place is after ἀρχαί, — a position from which it was early displaced by some careless transcriber. To say that the apostle dictated the terms in the order given by the Revisers because, as some say, he meant "powers" in the most general sense of the term, is, at best,

only an attempt to defend a false reading. There is nothing in the context to indicate that such was the case. A glance at the passage shows, rather, that δυνάμεις is called for after ἀρχαί, or else not at all. With this word, it forms a compound term, "principalities and powers," by which, as by the similar expression in Eph. vi. 12, the apostle designates those evil spiritual agencies against which the Christian has to contend. This seems obvious from the contrasts running through the passage, — death and life, angels and evil spirits, things present and things to come, height and depth, — a succession of antitheses, followed by the all-embracing specification, "nor any other created object." This gives concinnity and harmony to the whole train of thought. But the other order not only breaks up this adaptation of terms to each other, and leaves us without any apparent reason for the introduction of δυνάμεις, but represents the apostle as employing two words in a strangely un-Pauline manner. It will, no doubt, be said, "But we must take the text as we find it, and not try to shape it to our notions of what it should be." Very true. But what is the text? Not necessarily what a few of the oldest known documents, say the five oldest extant manuscripts, present to us. If it were, all we should need to do, would be to follow them without any regard to other witnesses. But this we cannot do, for no two of them present the same text. They are continually in conflict, more or less, one with another. In one verse, they may be united in presenting a true reading; in the next, be more or less divided between true and false readings; while, in the third, they may conspire in presenting a spurious reading. We are not pleading for conjectural readings. The reading we adhere to as presenting the apostle's language here is by no means without support. It is sustained not only by the oldest known version of the New Testament, which fact ought to have some weight, but by strong, if not overwhelming, intrinsic probability. Internal evidence of this character supported by a comparatively few documents is often stronger testimony in favor of a reading than that of scores and even hundreds of external witnesses to the contrary.

X. 3.

Rec. T. τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην ζητοῦντες στήσαι — going about to establish their own righteousness.

Rev. T. τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στήσαι — seeking to establish their own.

There is hardly sufficient warrant for the omission of "righteousness" here. The manuscript testimony is about equally divided between the two readings. But the internal evidence strongly favors the received reading. The apostle as the original writer would naturally give this, the word embodying the most prominent idea in his mind, in each of the three instances in which it appears in the verse; while a critical reader would be tempted to improve the phrasing by striking out the word if possible in at least one of the three instances, so as to avoid its unpleasant recurrence. The word appears here in **Σ**, F, G, K, L, nearly all the cursives, the Syriac Versions, both forms of the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Ambrose, and others, but is omitted in A, B, D, E, P, three cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen again, Clement, Basil, Chrysostom too, and Cyril, Augustine, and others. It would hardly have found a place here if it were not genuine.

X. 5.

Rec. T. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς — For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

Rev. T. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ — For Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby.

This verse is given as a reason for the statement contained in the preceding verse; namely, that, to every one that believeth, Christ is the end of law unto righteousness. Having thus spoken of the observance of the law as a means to right-

eousness, the apostle seeks to confirm the statement by saying, not because Moses writes that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live by that righteousness (Moses nowhere makes such a statement); but because Moses describes the righteousness which is of the law to be, that the man who *doeth* the things prescribed by the law shall live by them, *i.e.* by fulfilling those requirements, as stated in Lev. xviii. 5 and Gal. iii. 12. In other words, Moses represents the righteousness required by law as consisting in the *doing* of something. But Christ is the end of all this. The righteousness of the gospel consists in *believing*. As far as the law was a means to righteousness, it ceased with Christ's fulfilment of it.

Now there have evidently been a number of alterations made in the apostle's language here by different manuscripts. In the first place, there was no apparent antecedent for αὐτά; hence this must needs be dropped. Then there was no antecedent for αὐτοῖς, and this must be changed to αὐτῇ, so as to refer back to δικαιοσύνην. But, since this failed to give a reading altogether satisfactory, it was thought necessary to remove ὅτι, and place it immediately after γράφει. But, while this may improve the sense, it makes a misstatement, and destroys the apostle's argument. The apostle is simply quoting here, as he is also in Gal. iii. 12, in support of his position, the language of Moses as given by the LXX. That he should not quote it in this verse, where his reasoning calls for it, and yet should quote it in a similar connection in the other epistle, is incredible. It should be allowed to stand unchanged, as the Received Text presents it, in both places. These alterations were made, of course, during the second or third century, those early days when the New-Testament Scriptures were so freely tampered with.

X. 9.

The reading of the margin, "confess the word with thy mouth, that Jesus is Lord," is a reading of the Vatican manuscript, found also in Clement of Alexandria, and partly followed

by a single cursive, 71, and in another part by a single version, — the Memphitic. It deserves no notice, however, having nothing to commend it, and being unsupported by any evidence of weight. In consequence of Westcott and Hort's reverence for the Vatican manuscript, it is adopted by them. Hence its appearance in the Revisers' margin.

xi. 17.

Rec. T. τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πύκνότητος — of the root and fatness.

Rev. T. τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πύκνότητος — of the root of the fatness.

The only evidence in support of the Revisers' reading is the testimony of **Σ** first hand, B, and C. John Damascene in different places seems to favor both readings. Tischendorf conjectures that the presence of the conjunction in the commonly accepted reading is due to the troublesome nature of the reading presented by these three manuscripts. But the more troublesome fact concerning this reading is that it is found in only three manuscripts, and receives no support from internal evidence. The absence of the conjunction in certain ancient exemplars may account for the reading found in D first hand, F, G, and their accompanying Latin versions, which omit τῆς ῥίζης καί. But, no doubt, καί was accidentally omitted by some early transcriber from whose copy these manuscripts are descended, while **Σ**'s seventh-century emendator, A, D as afterwards corrected, E, L, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic have descended from exemplars not thus vitiated. Admitting that the Revisers' Text presents the true reading, what does ῥίζα, "root," here mean? Prebendary Humphry, himself one of the New-Testament Revisers, says, "the source and origin of its richness." If this is true, the apostle does not use the word literally, but figuratively, as in 1 Tim. vi. 10. Yet, in both the previous and the succeeding verse, he contrasts "root" with "branches," and means thereby the

literal root, the underground part of the tree of which he is speaking. Even in this verse, he refers to the branches no less than three times, and the last time in such a way as to leave no room to suppose that he means anything different from what he means in the other verses: "Thou didst become partaker in common with the branches of the root (as well as the fatness) of the olive tree." The meaning of which evidently is that the Gentile, being incorporated by faith into the true Israel, denoted by the olive tree, becomes, together with those among whom he is incorporated, a partaker of the root, *i.e.* of Christ, and of the fatness of the tree, *i.e.* of the blessings which believers derive from Christ. Compare with this the revised reading: "Thou didst become partaker with the branches of the root (or source) of the fatness of the olive tree," *i.e.* of Christ. But why this roundabout phrase, "the root of the fatness"? The fatness of the olive tree is something that has not been referred to in any previous verse so as to make the expression "the root (or source) of the fatness" at all pertinent or called for. Had this been the apostle's meaning, he would naturally have said, "become partakers with them of the root of the olive tree." But this is only half of his meaning. Or, if his words had been written in the reverse order and without the conjunction, so as to allow of their being rendered, as in the Memphitic Version, "partaker with them of *the fatness of the root* of the olive tree," the word "root" still having the same signification as in the verses preceding and following, the reading would be more natural, and more in harmony with the context, though it would transfer the idea of fatness from the tree to the root. But to say that "root" here means not the root of the olive tree, but the source of its richness, is to give an exceedingly lame defence for an obviously false reading. The truth is, the revised reading is a long-discarded error, utterly unworthy of being revived. It disappeared soon after it originated, and should have been left among the old manuscripts where it was found.

xii. 11.

The reading of the marginal note, "serving the opportunity" instead of "serving the Lord," is attested only by D first hand, F, G, one cursive, a few Latin versions and Latin Fathers. It is not the weight of documentary evidence that seems to have called forth the note, but the fact that many commentators and scholars have thought, and perhaps still think, this the true reading. Even so able a commentator as Meyer, while admitting that "κυρίῳ is certainly the oldest and most diffused reading," says "if it were original, we cannot well see why καιρῷ should have been substituted for it." It could not have been done intentionally. But we need not be at a loss to see that some copyist might easily have mistaken the abbreviation ΚΡΩ [κυρίῳ] for ΚΡΩ [καιρῷ], these being the forms in which these words were anciently written. This would have been the more readily done if the scribe regarded, as he probably did regard, the injunction as only another way of expressing what we find in Eph. v. 16, and Col. iv. 5. The main objection urged against κυρίῳ is that "serving the Lord" is a precept not suited to the context; that, while it enjoins a comprehensive duty, the injunction is thrown in as an independent precept among others of special and less comprehensive range. This, however, is a false view of the passage. The apostle had said, "In zeal, be not backward; in spirit, be fervent." Then, lest any one should misunderstand or pervert his meaning, he adds as a qualifying clause referring back to both these injunctions, "serving the Lord." It shows in whose service he would have their zeal and earnestness employed. The words, so far from being superfluous or misplaced, are necessary; they are altogether pertinent. As an addition to the two previous clauses, they are perfectly Pauline, somewhat similar in effect to the qualifying phrase "in the Lord" affixed to various expressions or clauses in this epistle and elsewhere. The reading "serving the time," or "serving the opportunity," as a possibly genuine reading, is really deserving of no consideration whatever.

xiii. 11.

Rec. T. ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἦδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι — now it is high time to awake out of sleep; *i.e.* for us to awake, etc.

Rev. T. ὥρα ἦδη ὑμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι — now it is high time for you to awake out of sleep.

The common reading, ἡμᾶς, is attested by S's seventh-century emendator, D, E, F, G, L, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Gothic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The Philoxenian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions, and Origen and Cyril, like our A. V., omit the pronoun. The revised reading is that of S first hand, A, B, C, P, three cursives, and one passage of Clement of Alexandria, — not overwhelming evidence, it must be confessed. It is adopted, however, by Tischendorf, Alford, and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers; while Lachmann, Tregelles, Meyer, and others adopt the received as the genuine reading. It looks like a change made to save the apostle from including himself among those needing to awake out of sleep, — a change favored by the participle εἰδότες, "since ye know." Or it may have been thought to be the only proper word to follow the passive verb, ἐγερθῆναι, taken in the sense of *being roused*, rather than in its later intransitive and more common New-Testament sense of *awaking*; as if the apostle meant to say, "It is high time for you to be aroused from your sleep"; — the necessary rousing or awakening to be effected by his words to them. But we have no evidence that the Christians at Rome were asleep more than others, so as to make it necessary for the apostle to say to them particularly, "It is high time for *you* to awake," or, "for *you* to be roused." The exhortation, from his standpoint in reference to Christ's second coming, was one applicable to Christians generally, on whose behalf he is here speaking. It is therefore altogether unnatural for him to say, — indeed, improbable that he should have said, "It is time for *you* to

awake." In the succeeding verses, he did not hesitate to include himself among those who should cast off the works of darkness, put on the armor of light, and walk honestly, not in revelling, etc. We are confirmed in the conclusion that he must have written ἡμᾶς instead of ὑμᾶς by the fact that it was not Paul's manner of writing to give an irrelevant reason for anything. And yet, if the Revisers are right, he has done it in saying νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία, whether we render it, with the A. V., "for now is our salvation nearer," or, with the R. V., "for now is salvation nearer to us," than when we believed. To give a consistent reason for saying "*you* should awake," one would naturally say, "For now is *your* salvation nearer," or, "now is salvation nearer *to you*." Ὑμᾶς seems to be an early alteration that gained but little favor, and was confined to Alexandria, where it undoubtedly originated.

xiv. 4.

Rec. T. ὁ Θεός — God.

Rev. T. ὁ Κύριος — the Lord.

"For *the Lord* hath power to make him stand." This reading is attested by the four oldest uncials, together with P, a ninth-century uncial, and is also the reading of the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions. The Peshito Syriac Version, which is two centuries older than the Vatican Codex, translates the verse as follows: "Who art thou, that thou judgest a servant not thine own, who, if he standeth, standeth to his Lord; and if he falleth, he falleth to his Lord? But he will assuredly stand; for his Lord hath power to establish him;" — *explaining* the Greek ὁ Θεός by an additional use of the phrase, "his Lord." It is not an uncommon thing for this Version to insert a gloss, instead of closely following the original. (The Philoxenian Syriac, which is noted for its extreme literalness, has "God," not "the Lord," here.) This gloss of the Peshito Version was afterwards introduced into the

margin of certain Eastern Greek manuscripts, and, in consequence of its repeated occurrence in the sixth and following verses, readily passed from the margin into the text of subsequent Alexandrian manuscripts, not in the form, "his Lord," but "the Lord," ὁ κύριος. It is evidently what Dr. Hort would call "a Syrian reading." The true reading is ὁ Θεός, the word that appeared in other manuscripts, and still appears in D, E, F, G, L, and the whole body of the cursives, as well as in the Vulgate and Old Latin Versions. This is also the reading of the Fathers generally, from Origen downward. It is not taken, as Tischendorf intimates it might be, from verse 3, "for *God* hath received him." There, there was no motive for changing "God" to "the Lord," as there was here; otherwise the change would doubtless have been made, and the entire context would have favored it.

xiv. 6.

Rec. T. καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ — and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.

Rev. T. omits.

Meyer, who adopts the reading followed by the Revisers, says, "The opposite of the observance of days, Paul has not added because he has not at the beginning of this verse planned his language antithetically." But this statement will hardly bear testing. Throughout the preceding context, from the first verse of the chapter, the language is antithetical. In verse 1, the receiving of a weak brother is contrasted with his non-reception "to doubtful disputations." In verse 2, one who believeth in eating all things is set in contrast with one who has not this belief, but eats only herbs. In verse 3, the former is counselled not to despise the latter; and the latter is charged not to judge the former. In verse 4, the man that judges another's servant is given to understand that not he, but the servant's master, is that servant's judge. In verse 5, one man is repre-

sented as esteeming one day above another; while another, in contrast with him, is represented as esteeming all days alike. Hence it is scarcely just to the apostle to say that he had not at the beginning of this verse planned his language antithetically. He had so planned it from the beginning of the chapter. It is hardly possible, therefore, to believe that he could have said, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord," without introducing its antithesis, especially as the antithetical strain continues in the latter part of the verse and the two verses following. It is on account of this antithetical character of the whole context that we are more and more convinced that the words omitted from the Revisers' Text must be genuine. Completeness in expressing the apostle's thought calls for their presence. It is true, the external testimony in favor of the omission appears strong. But the bare fact that the oldest known manuscripts omit these words is not in itself proof decisive against their genuineness. There is, in the very idea of the apostle's speaking favorably of the non-observance of days held sacred by many, something forbidding to a scrupulous mind,—one of weak faith on this point. In those early days of the Christian Church, when the exact language of the New-Testament writers was less sacredly observed than in later centuries, and when we know that liberties were taken again and again with their language, a copyist who questioned the propriety of not regarding one day above another, and to whom the idea was offensive, might very easily have satisfied himself that he had discharged his duty as a scribe by inserting only the first half of what he found here written in reference to the observance of days. This is quite as probable as that the omission is due to *homoioleuton*, to which it may possibly be owing. But, whatever may be the reason of the non-appearance of this clause in most of the uncials, we are far from believing that it is an interpolation in the Syriac Versions, one of which runs back well nigh to the apostles' days. It has every appearance of being genuine, and is demanded by the

context and the style of argument adopted by the apostle. The widespread nature of the omission is due to the early date at which it was made. On the other hand, Basil of Cesarea, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Photius, and other Fathers, attest the words as genuine, as well as C third hand, L, P, most of the cursives, and the Armenian and two Syriac Versions.

xiv. 19.

The Revisers attach to this verse the note, "Many ancient authorities read, *we follow*"; that is, instead of "let us follow." But this is one of those marginal notes that tend to lumber up the volume, and certainly benefit nobody. It cannot be said to have been inserted in the interests of justice or candor. Though Tischendorf adopts it, he does it from what he feels to be the force of "authority"; that is, the testimony of his favorite Sinaitic Codex, supported by A, B, F, G, L, P, and half a dozen cursives. Of all the versions, not one adopts it; and it is all but universally regarded a false reading, having crept into the text at an early day in consequence of the error of some copyist in writing an *o* for an *ω*. Such transparent errors, as common as they are transparent, however respectably supported, ought not to be thus dragged to the light, and made to appear worthy of consideration. It is true that C, D, and E are the only uncials that read *διώκωμεν*, "let us follow"; but they are supported by the context, by all the versions, by nearly all the cursives, and approved generally by commentators and editors, even by Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 22.

Rec. T. *οὐ πιστὶν ἔχεις*; — Hast thou faith?

Rev. T. *οὐ πιστὶν ἣν ἔχεις* — The faith which thou hast.

The Revisers' reading is attested by the four oldest manuscripts *Σ*, A, B, C, — all Alexandrian, and by only one of the ancient versions, — the Memphitic. If this is the true reading,

how shall we account for the fact that it is not found in any of the old versions except that of the people among whom the four oldest codices originated? The testimony of all these witnesses amounts virtually to that of but one witness. Other than these, the only manuscript testimony in support of this reading is a tenth-century copy of the Latin Vulgate Version; whereas the testimony of D, E, F, G, L, P, of the whole body of the cursives, of all other Latin Versions, of the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, — that is, the testimony of all the rest of ancient Christendom, — is in support of the received reading. However we may seek to account for the presence of ἣν, "which," it has every appearance of being an interpolation, — either accidentally or designedly such. The absence of the article before πίστιν followed by a relative clause is a fatal objection to the admission of such a clause. Compare Gal. i. 23. Again, the presence of ἣν makes σὺ, "thou," the subject not of ἔχεις but of the more remote ἔχε; and makes it unaccountably emphatic by removing it so far from its verb. It is difficult to see why the subject of this verb need be expressed at all, much more why it should be made so very emphatic. Moreover, admitting that the apostle could have written πίστιν ἣν for τὴν πίστιν ἣν, and that his meaning therefore is, "*The faith which thou hast*, have THOU to thyself before God," it must be acknowledged the whole reading has an air of stiffness unnatural to Paul, which renders it exceedingly suspicious, though favored by the most ancient of known Greek manuscripts. But, with the common reading, the passage presents all the simplicity, directness, and naturalness peculiar to the apostle. His argument is that Christians should pursue a course that will edify instead of injuring their brethren, even in reference to things lawful and innocent. Consequently they should not knowingly eat flesh that may possibly have been offered in sacrifice to idols, or drink wine, or do anything else that will cause others to stumble. Then appealing to his readers individually, he very naturally says, either concessively, "THOU

hast faith?" or interrogatively, "Hast THOU faith?" *i.e.* to eat all things (verse 2), or what others may consider unclean. (Verse 14) "Have it to thyself"; don't parade it before others who have different views from yours, and who consider your course sinful. This is relevant, and perfectly Pauline. But to say, "Do THOU, [the] faith which thou hast, have to thyself before God," is to speak in an ungrammatical and apparently uncalled for manner, altogether unlike the apostle's ordinary mode of expression. This false reading seems to have grown out of a careless repetition of the last syllable of πίστιν, making ΠΙCΤΙΝΤΙΝΕΧΕΙC out of the two words πίστιν and ἔχεις. But a subsequent copyist, naturally considering the second TI a mistake for H, changed the reading to ΠΙCΤΙΝΗΝΕΧΕΙC, *i.e.* πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις.

xiv. 23.

It is very true that a large number of manuscripts, some ancient, insert after this verse the doxology found in chapter xvi. 25-27. But we question whether it is legitimate revision work to insert this statement in the margin without saying anything more. That the doxology properly belongs here, few scholars at present contend. It was brought in through the Lectionaries or early church service books, which inserted it at the close of a lesson. It was thus that it found its way into the text both here and at the end of the epistle in A, P, 5, 17, and certain copies of the Armenian Version. In some manuscripts, as L, about two hundred cursives, the lectionaries, and a few third-class versions, it appears here, but not at the end of the epistle. And so Griesbach and Matthæi have it in their editions; but this is not generally approved. Others still, as D third hand, F, G, considering it altogether spurious, omit it in both places. But the preponderance of testimony assigns it its place at the end of the epistle, and there only. It would be quite as suitable to append to chapter xvi. 25 the note, "Some authorities question the genuineness of this passage," as

it is to give the note here annexed, or the one there placed in the margin. Indeed, no such note as we find in either of these places is really called for.

ΣΤ. 15.

Rec. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ—the grace that is given to me of God.

Rev. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ—the grace that was given me of God.

There is no difference here made in the rendering of ὑπό and ἀπό. There is, however, this difference in the meaning of the two prepositions: the former, employed as here, means “by,” and refers to God as the efficient cause, the giver; while the latter means “from,” with a reference to God as the primal *source* of the gift. The weight of external evidence is greatly in favor of the former; the latter being attested only by Σ, B, F, and the doubtful testimony of John Damascene. This reading may have proceeded from a mistaking of the word in the exemplar by an early scribe, as indeed the other might have proceeded from a misreading of this. But ἀπό has rather the appearance of being an altered reading, made with a view of bringing the passage into conformity with expressions found elsewhere, as in James i. 17; also 2 Cor. v. 18, “All things are *from* God,” but by Jesus Christ. In Acts ix. 15, xiii. 47, xxii. 21, xxvi. 16, Rom. i. 5, etc., the apostle is represented as having received his commission as an apostle to the Gentiles through the Lord Jesus,—an idea which would be expressed by ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ rather than by the unqualified phrase ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Hence, apparently, the change from ὑπό to ἀπό.

ΣΤ. 17.

Rec. T. ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν—I have therefore whereof I may glory.

Rev. T. ἔχω οὖν τὴν καύχησιν—I have therefore my glorying.

The latter reading is attested by B, C apparently, D, E, F, G, and the single cursive 37; the former, by Σ, A, L, P, the rest

of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, and the Armenian Version, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and John Damascene. The position of ἔχω shows that special emphasis is to be given to “I have.” Accordingly, the Revised Text must mean, I *have* therefore the glorying (that I have) in Christ Jesus as regards things pertaining to God. It is not a mere fancy. It is something that truly belongs to me, something that I really possess. Others may deny it to me; but this cannot affect the truth in the case, or prove that I have no such glorying. But what the special significance or pertinence of such a declaration can be, especially in this connection, it is difficult to see. The apostle has said nothing previous to this concerning glorying in Christ. Why, then, should he draw the conclusion, “Therefore I have my glorying in Christ”? It seems to be a very unnatural and strange conclusion to arrive at from the premises in the case. And yet it is the only conclusion that the presence of the article seems to allow. That gives definiteness to the glorying, and makes it the apostle’s. But remove the article, and a different meaning presents itself: “I have therefore a glorying—a subject or ground of glorying”; or, “I have therefore whereof I may glory.” It will not do to say that καύχῃσις does not admit this meaning. Both here and in 2 Cor. i. 12, to say nothing of Rom. iii. 27, the apostle uses καύχῃσις as equivalent to καύχημα, just as in Rom. viii. 39, he uses κτίσις for κτίσμα. Nor is this all. In 1 Cor. v. 6, 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3, Phil. i. 26, he uses καύχημα where we might naturally expect to see καύχῃσις. In short, he employs the two words interchangeably in accordance with later Greek usage. Taking the word, then, without the article,—a reading that is really more strongly attested than the other,—the meaning is both plain and pertinent. In the preceding verses, the apostle refers to the grace that had been bestowed upon him that he should be a minister of Christ among the Gentiles. In view of this unspeakable privilege, he says, “I *have* therefore ground of glorying in Christ Jesus in

things pertaining to God." Men may say I have not, but I have. It is an act of unspeakable grace on God's part to permit me to preach Christ among the Gentiles. I glory in it. After thus positively stating that he regarded the relation which he sustained to God in being called to the ministry of the Gospel as a ground of glorying in Christ, he adds as a reason for saying this, "For I dare¹ not speak except of things which Christ has wrought through me," having permitted me to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and through the intermediate countries, especially where no other preacher of the gospel has been before me. Thus favored of God, the apostle felt warranted in saying, "I *have* therefore reason for boasting in Christ in matters pertaining to God." How the article ever crept into the text, one may not be able to say positively, any more than he can explain how Didymus of Alexandria, in quoting this passage, should again and again have written *πεποιθήσιν*, "confidence," in place of *καύχῃσιν*, unless it was to present his idea of the apostle's meaning. It is enough to show that the article does not belong there, and that there is sufficient evidence to justify one in taking this position.

xvi. 27.

The A. V. has "to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever," where the R. V. reads, "to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever." The Greek in both Texts is the same. But the Revisers have the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit *to whom*." These authorities are B, two cursives (33, 72), the Peshito Syriac, the Latin Version of F, and Origen; while two other

¹ That is, reading *τολμῶ*, the present, with *ℵ*'s seventh-century emendator, B, the Peshito Syriac, *d, e, f, g*, the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, Origen, and others of the Fathers, — a form which Westcott and Hort have placed in their margin, but which really seems to be the true reading.

cursives read *εἴη δόξα*, "be glory," in place of *ᾧ ἡ δόξα*, "to whom the glory." The preponderance of external evidence, therefore, is very greatly in favor of the retention of *ᾧ*, "to whom." But this makes an exceedingly hard reading, — a circumstance, it is true, which in the eyes of some is all the more in its favor, as affording an argument in proof of its genuineness. Yet it is difficult to believe that the apostle could have written these last three verses in this disconnected manner. Nor should this belief be entertained except as a necessity from which there is no reasonable ground of escape. The fact that B alone of all the uncials omits *ᾧ* looks, it must be confessed, like an evident attempt, on the part of the copyist of that manuscript, or of some one who had preceded him, to remove a difficulty. But, if this is true of him, it must be true also of another scribe a hundred years or more earlier than that of B, one of whose copies was in the hands of Origen, who quotes the passage without the relative. And, if true of these, it must also be true of the translator or translators of the Peshito Syriac Version, who lived in another part of Christendom, and at least another hundred years earlier. But if, in these three separate instances, different scribes should have pursued one and the same course, it really seems strange that the same thing was not more extensively done, as it must have suggested itself to others also, and could have been effected so very easily. Now the fact that the Sinaitic manuscript has the relative is proof that *ᾧ* was considered by some as a part of the text as early as the middle of the fourth century. And the fact that it exists in all but one of the earliest Greek manuscripts, and in all but one or two of the earliest Versions, is presumptive evidence that it must have been an accepted reading for many years previous to that, if not from the very first. Still, we believe that *ᾧ* is no part of the original text, but that this text is correctly handed down by B, the Peshito Syriac Version, and the few other documents that omit "to whom." When we consider the length of this doxology (verses

25-27), and the ease with which the connection may be lost by a copyist before reaching the end, especially in the comparatively slow process of writing in uncials, it is by no means difficult to believe that an early scribe, to whom the form of the doxology in Gal. i. 5, 2 Tim. iv. 18, and Heb. xiii. 21, was familiar, having lost the connection, and trusting to his memory for the moment, rather than observing his exemplar, should have unconsciously inserted the ϕ that appears in those places. Any one who is accustomed to do much in copying, as well as in the way of original composition, and observing his mistakes, will realize that a copyist is far more likely, in similar circumstances, to introduce an error of this kind than the original writer would be. And we are the more convinced that "to whom" was thus introduced by the fact that Σ , A, D, E, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, and other witnesses for this reading add the $\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omega\nu$, "and ever," of those verses; while B, C, and other documents are without this additional phrase. Codices P, 31, 54, and the copy of this epistle that was in Chrysostom's possession, as well as the Memphitic Version, instead of "to whom," have "to him." But this is simply an attempt to correct the phraseology by making it correspond with Rom. xi. 36.

I CORINTHIANS.

i. 15.

Rec. T. $\text{ἵνα μή τις εἶπη ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβάπτισα.}$ — Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.

Rev. T. $\text{ἵνα μή τις εἶπη ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε.}$ — lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name.

The first of these is the reading of C third hand, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Gothic Versions, Theodoret, Tertullian, and others. The latter follows Σ , A, B, C first hand, ten cursives, the Latin versions of E and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. There is no perceptible difference in the meaning of the two readings; so that the apostle might have expressed himself equally well in either. In verse 13, he expresses his thoughts successively in the passive: "*Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or, were ye baptized in the name of Paul?*" This is natural; it is Paul-like. In verses 14-16, however, he quite as obviously expressed himself successively in the active: "*I baptized none of you . . . lest any should say I baptized in my own name . . . I baptized also the household of Stephanas . . . I know not whether I baptized any other.*" This, too, is perfectly natural, and what might be expected from the apostle. But some early critic seems to have taken offence at the monotonous recurrence of the aorist active; and, in order to vary the expression without affecting the apostle's meaning, substituted the passive form, which he had just found in verse 13. This, however, did not satisfy

every reader; hence it was afterwards changed to *ἐβαπτίσθη*, "he was baptized." This is the reading of Euthalius, and of the cursives 10, 31. The change was evidently wrought to make the verb correspond grammatically with the one preceding it: "Lest *any one* should say that *he was baptized* in my name." If the passive were the original reading here, it is difficult to see why it should ever have been set aside for the active. The active, however, has every indication of being genuine; and there is no good reason why it should be abandoned.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. *καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*. — declaring unto you the testimony of God.

Rev. T. *καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*. — proclaiming to you the mystery of God.

The common reading is that of **Σ**'s seventh-century emendator, B, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, both Ethiopic Versions, the Armenian, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, John Damascene, Pelagius, and others. The revised is supported by **Σ** first hand, A, C, seven or eight cursives, one Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, and by Antiochus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Ambrosiaster. It looks like a gloss, introduced from verse 7, to obviate the difficulty presented by the expression, "the testimony of God," a phrase nowhere else used as a synonym of the Gospel. "The testimony of Christ" is an expression employed in verse 6 of the preceding chapter as synonymous with "the gospel of Christ"; *i.e.* the testimony borne concerning him by his followers. But the phrase "the testimony of God" evidently admits of no such interpretation: it can mean only the testimony given by God, — what God testifies to or declares. This supposed difficulty seems to have led to the substitution of *μυστήριον*, the "mystery," *i.e.* the secret which God had kept to himself from the foundation of the world, but which he revealed to men in the coming of Christ.

This "mystery" is sometimes spoken of as the mystery of God, and sometimes as the mystery of Christ, — quite as often the former as the latter. Hence the ease with which it found its way here in place of "testimony." If the latter word, as some suppose, had been introduced from i. 6, the phrase would undoubtedly have been changed to correspond throughout with that, — "the testimony of Christ." We cannot but conclude that the common reading, which certainly has a preponderance of evidence, both external and internal, in its favor, is the genuine reading. It is so regarded by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, and others. But Griesbach favors *μυστήριον*; and Westcott and Hort adopt it, placing *μαρτύριον* in the margin as a secondary reading.

iii. 12.

Rec. T. *εἰ δὲ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον τούτων* — Now if any man build upon this foundation.

Rev. T. *εἰ δὲ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον* — But if any man buildeth on the foundation.

The presence of *τούτων* is attested by **Σ**'s seventh-century emendator, C third hand, D, E, L, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Augustine, and others. The word is omitted in **Σ** first hand, A, B, C first hand, one Old Latin Version, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, and by Cyril of Alexandria, and Ambrose. Among words of similar ending, it might very easily have dropped out in copying without being missed. It is by no means probable that the apostle introduced the word *θεμέλιον*, "foundation," in this connection without *τούτων* as its natural accompaniment, pointing back to the foundation mentioned in the preceding clause. It is easier to believe that the word is wanting in a few documents through the carelessness of some early transcriber than that it was omitted by the apostle or his amanuensis.

iv. 2.

Rec. T. $\delta\delta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, — Moreover.

Rev. T. $\omega\delta\epsilon$, $\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, — Here, moreover.

The received reading is found in D as corrected by a later hand, E, L, most of the cursives, Origen three times, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, and others. The revised is that of Σ , A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, six cursives, the Latin versions of D and E as well as of F and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, both forms of the Ethiopic, Origen once as represented by his Latin interpreter, Augustine, and others. The weight of external evidence is, no doubt, in favor of $\omega\delta\epsilon$; but, as Principal Edwards, who adopts the reading, says, "it is difficult to fix the meaning." If taken in the sense of "in this matter," it makes the phrase "in stewards" redundant. If the meaning is supposed to be "on earth," it indicates a contrast between faithfulness in this life and faithfulness in some other sphere. But there is evidently no implied contrast here, as there is in Col. iv. 9, or Heb. xiii. 14. To connect it, as Lachmann does, with the preceding verse, so as to read "stewards of the mysteries of God *in this matter*," is harsh, and makes the expression superfluous. To render it, with Meyer, "such being the case" or "in these circumstances," is to give it a signification unwarranted by its New Testament use, and having no special point or applicableness. Indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, the word is a very early transcriptional error for $\delta\delta\epsilon$, made in consequence of the scribe's writing from dictation, and misapprehending the true expression. Taking $\delta\delta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, "and what is more," as the true reading, there is no difficulty. The two verses taken together may be rendered as follows: "Such being the case, let a person regard us as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God: and, what is more, it is required on the part of stewards that a man be found faithful."

The rule that the more difficult reading is more likely to be

the true reading is, no doubt, an excellent rule in certain circumstances. But to push it to the extreme of making an unmeaning reading, that may easily be accounted for, appear to be the genuine reading, in the face of a plain if not self-evidently correct reading, is an abuse of the rule.

vii. 37, 38.

Rec. T. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota$. — doeth well . . . doeth well . . . doeth better.

Rev. T. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$. — shall do well . . . doeth well . . . shall do better.

The common reading is supported in the first of these instances by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, Theodoret, and John Damascene; in the last, by the same witnesses, together with the additional testimony of Clement, Methodius, and Chrysostom twice. The future of the Revised Text is attested in the first instance by Σ , A, B, 6, 17, 46, 67 second hand, Basil, the Memphitic, and its kindred version the Bashmuric; in the last instance, by all these except the Bashmuric, together with the additional testimony of Codex 37 and Euthalius. This future is an early alteration made for the sake of varying the phraseology. There is no more call for the future at the end of these two verses than in the middle of the latter verse, or at the end of verse 36, where the present, $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$, "sinneth not," remains undisturbed. The apostle, no doubt, wrote the present in each of these four instances; but a meddling critic sought to improve his language.

viii. 4.

Rec. T. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$. — there is none other God but one.

Rev. T. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$. — there is no God but one.

The former of these is the reading of Σ as amended early in the seventh century, K, L, most of the cursives, the Peshito

and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The latter is attested by **Σ** first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, P, eight cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil, Euthalius, Cyril, Irenæus as represented by his Latin interpreter, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. The revised reading thus appears to be the more strongly attested. This, however, is only to be expected; for *ἕτερος* has the appearance of being superfluous; and, in copying from different exemplars, one or more of which were without *ἕτερος*, though the others had it, a scribe would naturally give the simpler and more concise form of expression the preference. But the bare fact that *ἕτερος* appears in any manuscripts is *prima-facie* evidence of its genuineness; for no scribe or reader would have been tempted to insert a word seemingly so utterly unnecessary.

viii. 7.

Rec. T. *τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδῶλου ἕως ἄρτι* — for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour.

Rev. T. *τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδῶλου* — but some, being used until now to the idol.

The common reading, *συνειδήσει*, is that of the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, D, E, F, G, L, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Tertullian, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revisers' *συνηθείᾳ* is found in **Σ** first hand, A, B, P, five cursives, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Ethiopic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Euthalius, John Damascene, and others. Of the two readings, the former is the more difficult. Hence, apparently from a misapprehension of its true meaning, the word *συνηθείᾳ*, in its classic sense of familiarity or intimacy, was originally written as a gloss in the margin, whence it was afterward introduced into the text in place of *συνειδήσει*, taken in the sense of consciousness or knowledge.

Thus, "conscience of the idol," or scrupulosity in regard to it, became transformed to familiarity with, or habituation to, the idol. The only unquestioned use the apostle makes of *συνήθεια* is in xi. 16, and then in the sense in which the evangelist John (xviii. 39) uses it: "We have no such *custom*." But this signification is very different from that presented in this verse. If, therefore, we can judge anything from the context, or from the apostle's acknowledged use of *συνήθεια*, the revised reading here, instead of restoring the original text, has only set it aside.

viii. 8.

Rec. T. *Βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παρίσθησι τῷ Θεῷ · οὔτε γὰρ ἐὰν φάγωμεν, περισσεύομεν · οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν, ὑστερούμεθα.* — But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither if we eat, are we the better: neither if we eat not, are we the worse.

Rev. T. *Βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ Θεῷ · οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσευνόμεθα.* — But meat will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.

We have here several points to notice. First, the present *παρίσθησι* of the Received Text is displaced by the future *παραστήσει*. This is the reading of **Σ** first hand, A, B, eight cursives, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and John Damascene, each of the three employing it twice, Cyril, and some manuscripts of Athanasius. The common reading is attested by the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, D, E, L, P (as well as by F and G, which read *συνίστησιν* instead), most of the cursives, the Vulgate, Origen once, Basil twice, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others. The word does not properly mean to "commend," but to "present," to "place before." The apostle's idea is, that food does not affect our standing before God; it places us on terms neither of fellowship nor of disfavor with him. It in no way determines our relation to him. The statement is of a general character, as true in reference to one

day as to another, as is evident from the expansion which the apostle gives to the thought: If we eat, we *are* no better; if we eat not, we *are* no worse. This calls for the present, *παρίστανει*, which the apostle no doubt wrote. But some early reader, perhaps governed by Rom. xiv. 10, considered the statement as having reference to man's standing before God in the final day of accounts; and so, by way of correcting the reading, changed it by two slight alterations to the future,—a form, however, which apparently obtained but little currency. Our second-century critic having made this change, his next step was to drop *γάρ* from the text, and set the last two clauses over against the first as an additional argument for indifference to meats. As the verse reads without *γάρ*, the first *οὔτε* means not simply "neither," but "neither on the other hand,"—the form of the negative implying a reference back to the negative of the preceding clause, as well as forward to the corresponding negative following. The verse is thus made to mean, now, food will not affect our standing before God in the final day of judgment. Neither, on the other hand, if we abstain from eating are we the worse now; nor, if we eat, are we the better. This, however, gives the language a forced and artificial appearance. But, if we return to the received reading, the argument becomes natural, forcible, and Paul-like: "Now, food does not affect our standing before God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; nor, if we eat not, are we the worse." The *γάρ* is omitted by *Σ*, A, B, four cursives, two copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen once, where he begins his citation with *οὔτε*, and would naturally omit *γάρ* as irrelevant, Basil, Euthalius, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, some of them quoting only what Origen quotes, and in the same manner that he does. The conjunction is given in D, E, F, G, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome's, Clement of Alexandria, Origen twice, Basil also, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. Now, as to the

transposed position of the last two clauses. Meyer thinks that the true order is for the negative clause to come first, as the Revisers have it. His reason is that "a transcriber would have a mechanical inclination to place the positive half of the statement first." Generally speaking, this is no doubt true. But there may be reasons to lead a transcriber or a corrector of the text to reverse the order, as is the case here. Having begun the verse by making it read, "Now, *food* will not affect our standing before God"; he would hardly go on with saying, "Neither, on the other hand, *if we eat*, are we *the better*," etc. He would naturally reverse the clauses, and say, "Neither, on the other hand, if we *abstain from food*—if we eat not, are we *the worse*"; then allow the clause, "neither, if we eat, are we the better," to follow as a sort of after-thought. The construction shows the hand of a reviser all the way through. This order is attested by A first hand, B, one cursive, five copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, and Basil once. The order of the Received Text is that of *Σ*, D, E, F, G, L, P, about all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, and some copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Ethiopic, Clement of Alexandria, Origen three times, Basil also once, Chrysostom twice, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and others; while Codex A second hand, by a careless misplacement of the negative, reads, "Neither, if we eat not, are we the better; nor, if we eat, are we the worse." The Revisers' reading, *περισσεύομεθα*, in place of *περισσεύομεν* which Westcott and Hort retain, is found only in B, and in Origen once. It is simply an attempt to make the two verbs correspond in form.

ix. 15.

If, as the Revisers claim, their revision of the Greek Text was the necessary foundation of their work of revising the English Text, it would seem as if that necessity ought to be every-

where manifest in the translation. We have already pointed out changes in the Greek that were in no way necessary to the renderings given, — readings, in fact, which were introduced into the text only to be abandoned in translating. Another of these occurs here. If the change from *ἵνα τις κενώσῃ* to *οὐδεὶς κενώσει* were a necessity to enable the Revisers faithfully to represent the apostle in English, then, on coming to translate, instead of abandoning the latter reading and following the former, they ought in faithfulness to have given some such a rendering as this: "It were good for me to die rather than — My glorying, no one shall make void." Some take *ἢ* to mean "or" instead of "than": — "It were good for me rather to die; or no one shall make my glorying void." But this, to say nothing of its obscurity, is a reading calling for a rendering of exceedingly questionable propriety. As far as we are aware, *μᾶλλον ἢ* invariably means "rather than." Lachmann adopts the reading; but, in his perplexity to give it a meaning, he punctuates it so as to make the apostle say, "It were good for me that I die rather than (that) my boasting (should). No one shall make (it) void." The difficulty of finding a satisfactory Pauline construction and meaning for the words is sufficient evidence against the genuineness of the reading. There certainly is some error in connection with it, however well attested it may be. And, as long as it affords an untranslatable phrasing, what can justify the claim of necessity, advanced on its behalf and on behalf of similar changes?

X. II.

Rec. T. *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις*. — Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples.

Rev. T. *ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις*. — Now these things happened unto them by way of example.

Πάντα, as given in the Received Text, is attested by C, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D and E, the

Vulgate, both Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen several times, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. It also appears in the transposed reading *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα*, in **Σ**, the Greek texts of D and E, F, G, five or six cursives, the Ethiopic Version, Augustine, and others. It is wanting in A, B, 17, the Thebaic Version, Marcion according to Epiphanius, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, and others. The word is probably a part of the genuine text, but was omitted as unnecessary, especially in the citations of the passage by the Fathers; and, from some of these, the omission may have crept into the few copies that are without the word. — The reading *τύποι* is attested by D, E, F, G, L, most of the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, and Thebaic Versions, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The revised reading *τυπικῶς*, on the other hand, is attested by **Σ**, A, B, C, K, P, twelve or more cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian, Marcion twice according to Epiphanius, Origen twice, Hippolytus, Basil twice, Macarius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. This is probably the original reading, but was changed to *τύποι* to correspond with the reading of verse 6. After this change, owing to the harshness of the reading *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον*, the verb was changed to the plural, as it reads in the Received and Revised Texts. This, as we pointed out in our note on Rom. ii. 14, is contrary to the apostle's *usus loquendi*. The plural of the verb is given by A, D, E, F, G, L, the majority of the cursives, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. But the singular is attested by **Σ**, B, C, K, L, twelve or more cursives, Marcion twice, Origen four times, and the rest of the witnesses that read *τυπικῶς*. As the singular verb *ἐγράφη* follows immediately after, it is by no means probable that a plural verb preceded, when both have the same subject, — "All these things *happened* to them typically, and *were written* for our admonition."

xii. 9.

Rec. T. ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι, — by the same Spirit.

Rev. T. ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Πνεύματι, — in the one Spirit.

The former is the reading of **Σ**, C third hand (the original scribe omitted the whole phrase), D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, Clement, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others. The latter is the reading of A, B, six cursives, the Vulgate, Didymus, Euthalius, Basil, John Damascene, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and other Latin Fathers. The former is apparently the true reading. 'Ενὶ seems to have been introduced from verse 11 in order to break up the uniformity of the apostle's language. In that verse, after having enumerated the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon one and another, the apostle naturally closes with saying, "All these worketh *one* and the *same* Spirit." But the use of ἐνὶ in verse 9 seems forced, there being nothing in the connection to indicate that the apostle really needed to say "by the *one* Spirit," rather than "by the *same* Spirit," as elsewhere. The evidence, both external and internal, preponderates in favor of the common reading.

xiii. 3.

The many ancient authorities, referred to in the marginal note as reading "If I give my body *that I may glory*," instead of "*to be burned*," are the three oldest Greek manuscripts, **Σ**, A, B, the eleventh-century cursive 17, whose text resembles B's more closely than any other known cursive's, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Roman Ethiopic, and Ephraem Syrus. The reading is manifestly false, and seems, obviously enough, to have originated in the mistaking of one letter for another, — the only difference between the two readings consisting in a single letter having a similar sound to that in the other. Bishop Wordsworth, in his note on the passage, well says that the reading so plainly spurious "is worth notice, as showing that

the best uncial manuscripts are not always to be depended on, and sometimes are blemished with errors." Notwithstanding the transparency of the error, Westcott and Hort adopt it as the genuine and only reading. And Dr. Hort adds that "it gives an excellent sense"; though it is hard to see it, even after he tries to show it.

xiv. 38.

This verse, as given by both the Revisers and the A. V., reads, "But if any man is ignorant, let him be ignorant." That is, the last verb is in the imperative, ἀγνοεῖτω. With some, it has been a question as to what the apostle really means. The words might be rendered, "But if any one ignores them [does not recognize and acknowledge the things that I write as commands of the Lord], let him ignore them," — he does it at his peril; it is not worth while to waste words on such a one. But, as the marginal note indicates, a number of ancient witnesses — **Σ** first hand, A first hand apparently, D first hand, F, G, Origen, and the Latin versions of D and E — give the present indicative passive, ἀγνοεῖται, "he is ignored," as the true reading. And this is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, apparently on account of its being the more difficult reading. But it seems impossible to give it a satisfactory meaning. It cannot legitimately be considered the present for the future. If the apostle meant "he will be ignored," *i.e.* in the day of judgment, it would have been as easy for him to say ἀγνοήσεται as ἀγνοεῖται. Besides, if this had been his meaning, he would hardly have abstained from inserting the emphatic αὐτός, — making the verse read, "But, if any one ignores them, he will himself be ignored." Jerome in his perplexity translates the word by the future, *ignorabitur*, "he will be ignored"; and Ambrose and Ambrosiaster approve of this reading, as Origen is also made to do by his Latin interpreter Rufinus. But there is no known Greek manuscript to support it. The only apparently genuine reading is that of the text, — "Let him be ignorant" of them.

XV. 14.

The authorities referred to in the marginal note, as reading "our (instead of your) faith also is vain," are B, D first hand, a few cursives, the Thebaic, Bashmuri, and Gothic Versions, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, Cyril, Œcumenius, Rufinus, and others. The reading seems to have been introduced in consequence of the wording of the preceding clause, "then is *our* preaching vain," and of that of the clause following, "Yea, and *we* are found false witnesses," etc. The accepted reading, however, is abundantly attested, though Westcott and Hort adopt the false reading of B, D, etc. Besides, — and this also indicates the genuineness of the common reading, — it yields a stronger argument in support of the apostle's position than if he had said, "Then vain is our preaching, vain also *our* faith"; for his preaching was but the result of his faith; so that, if the former was vain, the latter could hardly be otherwise. But by urging not only that his preaching, but that his hearers' faith also, was vain if Christ had not risen, he really enforced his reasoning.

XV. 49.

We have here the marginal reading, "Let us also bear the image of the heavenly." This, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort feel constrained to adopt as the true reading, — another illustration of the untrustworthiness of ancient manuscripts, even when agreed. The context is not hortatory, but argumentative, and designed to afford encouragement. The apostle argues that as the earthly Adam was, such also are his earthly descendants, — corruptible, exposed to sufferings and death; and as the heavenly Redeemer is, such are also the members of his heavenly family to be, — incorruptible, glorified. In other words, as we have borne the image — carried the likeness — of the earthy, by being subject to vanity, disease, and death, we shall also bear the image or likeness of

the heavenly, by being endowed with incorruptibility and glory. The language is in perfect accordance with the apostle's style of presenting truth in different forms. He was not satisfied with simply presenting it once; but he repeated it in other words, to bring it, if possible, more clearly and forcibly before his readers. Compare verses 42-44; also 53, 54. — *Εἰκών*, "image," has but one meaning in both clauses. What that is, the connection clearly shows. The apostle's aim obviously was to encourage his Christian readers to be steadfast and immovable in the faith in view of the resurrection to a life of glory awaiting them after death. An exhortation, in such a connection, to bear the image of the heavenly, would be altogether misplaced and out of harmony with the context. And yet this inadmissible marginal reading, which is very easily accounted for as an error of frequent occurrence, is attested by *Σ*, A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, by far the greater part of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Gothic, Origen repeatedly, Methodius, Cæsarius of Constantinople, Basil, Macarius, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Euthalius, Cyril, John Damascene, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, and others, — an apparently overwhelming torrent of authority! On the other hand, the only possibly genuine reading, that of the text, is attested by B, a comparatively small number of cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the Arabic Version, Origen in some editions, Cyril, Theodoret, Photius, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. (Compare Note on Rom. v. 1.)

2 CORINTHIANS.

i. 1.

Rec. T. ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—an apostle of Jesus Christ.

Rev. T. ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ—an apostle of Christ Jesus.

The latter is a well-known favorite order with Codex B,¹ which is supported here by the few additional witnesses, **S**, M, P, 17 of course, an eleventh-century manuscript of the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Euthalius, and Theodoret. It is hardly safe to follow the leading of B in a case like this, though the meaning is not affected in the least by so doing, when the received reading is attested by A, D, E, G, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a fifth-century fragment of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others,—reaching back at least a century and a half, possibly two centuries, earlier than the date of Codex B.

i. 10.

Rec. T. καὶ ῥύεται.—and doth deliver.

Rev. T. καὶ ῥύσεται.—and will deliver.

The whole verse reads, A. V., "Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us"; R. V., "Who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope that he will also still deliver us." The present, of the Received

Text, is attested by D third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, most of the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, all but three manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen two or three times, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Jerome, and Ambrosiaster. The future of the Revised Text is the reading of **S**, B, C, P, 17, and four other cursives, the Latin version of G, three manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Euthalius, and John Damascene. The Roman Ethiopic has both the present and the future. The difference in readings seems to have originated in the early omission of ῥύεται as superfluous, making the verse read, "Who delivered us from so great a death, and in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us." The text is thus given in A, D first hand, the Peshito Syriac, the Latin version of E, one manuscript of the Vulgate, Platt's Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. Some early reader, by a comparison of manuscripts, having discovered the omission, restored the word incorrectly, perhaps from having confounded it with ῥύσεται in the line below, while others replaced the genuine ῥύεται. This will account for the comparatively feeble uncial attestation of "doth deliver." That this is the true reading, however, there can hardly be a doubt. A critical reader would not be tempted to insert such an expression in such a connection. But it was just like the apostle to do it. It was an ever-abiding consciousness with him that God is the present as well as the past and future deliverer of those who trust in him. It led him on this occasion to say of God, He "has delivered" me from imminent death, and he "continues to deliver" me; and in his confidence in God, he adds, He "will yet deliver" me. His experience was that of the psalmist: "I sought the Lord, and he heard me, and *delivered* me from all my fears. Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord *delivereth* him out of them all. Yea, the Lord *shall* help them and *deliver* them; he *shall deliver* and save them, because they trust in him." Ps. xxxiv. 4, 19; xxxvii. 40.

¹ See Rom. i. 1; ii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 1; Gal. ii. 16, both times; Eph. i. 1, both times; i. 5; Phil. i. 1, both times; i. 6, etc.

iii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίναῖς. — in fleshly tables of the heart.

Rev. T. ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίαις σαρκίναῖς. — in tables *that are* hearts of flesh.

In attestation of the received reading, we have F, K, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, F, G (three of them against their own Greek), the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen several times, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Macarius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, John Damascene, Hilary, and others, — testimony, some of which runs back to the middle of the second century, or two hundred years earlier than the date of our oldest Greek manuscripts. The revised reading is attested by **Σ**, A, B, C, D, E, G, L, P, twenty-five or more cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac alone of all the versions, Eusebius also, and Euthalius. The latter, however, is plainly a transcriber's error in writing καρδίαις for καρδίας, — an error very easily committed in connection with the plural forms immediately preceding and following. The expression ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις in the foregoing verse may also have had some influence in misleading the copyist. The expression cannot properly be translated, however, as the Revisers have translated it; for σαρκίναῖς "fleshly" or "of flesh," belongs to πλαξί, "tables" or "tablets," as truly as λιθίναῖς, "of stone," belongs to the same word just before. The only legitimate rendering that can be given to the words is "tables of flesh (or 'fleshly tablets'), hearts." But the reading "hearts" is a palpable error for "of the heart," — one easily accounted for, and really deserving of no regard. To obtain the Revisers' rendering, the Greek would need to be ἐν πλαξὶ ταῖς καρδίαις σαρκίναῖς.

iii. 9.

The marginal reading, "For if there is glory in the ministry of condemnation," is attested by **Σ**, A, C, D first hand, F, G,

17, and six other cursives, several copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Ethiopic, Origen, Cyril, and Ambrosiaster. But it is an attempted improvement of the apostle's language. From the beginning of verse 7 to the end of verse 11, the leading idea with him, either expressed or implied, was the διακονία or "ministration." This naturally led him to express himself here as in the text: "the ministration . . . *is* glory," — not as in the marginal reading: "there is glory *in* the ministration," or "attaching to the ministration," etc.

iv. 6.

Rec. T. φῶς λάμψαι — light to shine.

Rev. T. φῶς λάμψει — light shall shine.

The former is attested by the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, C, D third hand, E, F, G, H, K, L, P, all but one or two cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, Marcion several times as cited by Epiphanius, Origen, Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, and others. The latter is the reading of **Σ** first hand, A, B, D first hand, 67 second hand, Clement, and possibly the Ethiopic Version. It does not readily commend itself as the true reading. The usual sign of direct address, the recitative ὅτι, is wanting before ἐκ. There is no known occasion on which God is previously spoken of as having said, "Light shall shine out of darkness," to which the apostle might be supposed to refer. There is no apparent reason why the apostle should depart from his ordinary mode of expression to introduce a single clause in direct discourse when the indirect seems far more to his purpose. To all which, it may be added that the reading is an obvious itacism, an early scribe having probably confounded λάμψαι with λάμψει as the words were dictated to him, and so wrote the latter for the former.

iv. 14.

The omission of "the Lord," in the clause "who raised up the Lord Jesus," to which the marginal note refers, is sanctioned by B, 17, 71, 73, one of the fragments of a fifth-century manuscript of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Tertullian, and others. But the word might easily have been omitted, as it probably was, because of its absence before Ἰησοῦ immediately following. None but a believer in the infallibility of Codex B would really think of omitting it.

v. 17.

Rec. T. γέγονε καινὰ τὰ πάντα. — all things are become new.

Rev. T. γέγονε καινά. — they are become new.

The former of these readings is supported by D second and third hands, E, K, L, P, all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the manuscripts of the Armenian Version, Platt's Ethiopic, Ignatius in his epistle to Polycarp as represented by his Latin interpreter, also in his epistle to the Magnesians, Justin Martyr, Origen, the Apostolic Constitutions, Methodius, Didymus, Ephraem Syrus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril in two passages, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, Ambrose in one of his epistles, Ambrosiaster, and others, — a strong array of witnesses from the earliest days. The revised reading is attested by **Σ**, B, C, D first hand, F, G, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, an early edition of the Armenian Version, the Roman Ethiopic, Athanasius according to a manuscript, Hilary, Ambrose in a second epistle, Augustine, and the author of *De Promissionibus* etc., of the fourth century. At the same time, the Peshito Syriac Version omits "and all things" from the beginning of the next verse, running the two verses together thus: "And all things are made new by God." Cyril of Alexandria, in two other places than those just referred to, summarily and loosely cites the words so as to

make them read, "Old things have passed away *and* become new." The difficulty seems to have been that some early transcriber, not being able to comprehend the apostle's meaning in the words, "Behold, *all things* have become new," and considering τὰ πάντα an erroneous reproduction of the τὰ πάντα immediately following, omitted it, and made what seemed to him the more natural subject, implied in τὰ ἀρχαῖα, take its place, giving us the reading, "Old things are passed away; behold, *they* have become new." But *how* old things have both passed away and become new, — that is, have disappeared and yet not disappeared, — he left his readers to conjecture. It is as if the revelator had said (Rev. xxi. 4, 5), "The former things are passed away; behold, I make *them* new."

xi. 4.

Rec. T. καλῶς ἡνείχεσθε. — ye might well bear with *him*.

Rev. T. καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε. — ye do well to bear with *him*.

The Received Text gives the reading of Codex 47, and a number of other cursives, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others. The Revisers' reading is that of B, D first hand, 17, and Cyril in a single passage. The true reading, however, seems to be that of **Σ**, D third hand, E, F virtually, G, H, K, L, M, P, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and John Damascene, — namely, ἀνείχεσθε, the reading adopted by Griesbach, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and admitted by Westcott and Hort into the margin. This and the received reading, however, are but different modes of writing the imperfect. But, as ἀνείχεσθε is the acknowledged genuine form of the word in verse 1, it is but proper, with all the evidence we have in its favor, to consider it the true form here. In verse 1, the other two forms — the present and the doubly augmented imperfect — are also found among the manuscripts as various readings for ἀνείχεσθε as well as here. But there, those readings are universally rejected as false. They are really deserving of no better fate here. This,

we think, will be apparent on considering the apostle's meaning. In verse 1, he had said, "I would that ye *might bear with* my foolishness a little." He then tells them (verses 2, 3) why he makes this request. After which, he goes on to say, "For, if he that cometh (among you) preacheth another Jesus than the one we preached, or if ye are receiving a different Spirit from the one ye received (through us), or a different gospel from that ye accepted (at our hands), *i.e.* if ye are in a mood to do this, ye *may well bear with* (us)." Is it asked why? The apostle himself gives the answer: "For I reckon that I am in no respect inferior to the most eminent apostles," etc. This gives unity, harmony, and force to his language, which the revised reading does not and cannot give. That reading is a substitution of the present indicative instead of the apostle's imperfect, apparently on account of the present *κηρύσσει*, "preacheth," and *λαμβάνετε*, "ye are receiving," employed by him in the protasis. But Paul must be trusted to say in his own way what he desired to say.

xi. 6.

Rec. T. *φανερωθέντες* — we have been made manifest.

Rev. T. *φανερώσαντες* — we have made *it* manifest.

The former is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a fragment of a fifth-century manuscript of the Old Latin Version, the Clementine Vulgate, two manuscripts of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and the poet Sedulius. The latter is attested by **Σ** first hand, B, F, G, and 17. But it is obviously a part of the gloss *φανερώσαντες ἑαυτούς*, "having manifested ourselves," originally written on the margin of an early manuscript to explain the meaning of *φανερωθέντες*. This gloss actually appears in full in M, two cursives, the Gothic and Armenian Versions; while, in 67, it appears as *φανερῶσαι ἑαυτούς*. Codex D first hand, a few Latin manuscripts, and Ambrosiaster

give the passive aorist participle in the nominative *singular* on account of the apostle's speaking of himself in the singular in both what precedes and what follows; while cursives 1, 108, give it in the dative singular, as agreeing with *παντί*. The active participle, used without the reflexive originally attached to it, and without any expressed object as it is in the Revised Text, seems to refer back to *γνώσει*, "knowledge," to furnish it with an object: "In everything we have made *our knowledge* manifest among all men to you-ward." But, just what this means, it is not very easy to see. One of the Revisers, commenting on it, explains it thus: "In every thing we have made the gospel which we preach manifest among all men with a view to your benefit."¹ The reader can take his choice. We prefer to restore the apostle's word, which the Revisers have rejected, and read: "But if [we are] indeed deficient in speech, yet [we are] not in knowledge, but [the contrary], as in every respect we showed ourselves in all things relating to you"; *i.e.* while we were with you. This rendering is necessitated by the participle, which, so far from being equivalent to a verb in an independent clause as the versions make it, introduces a dependent clause; and this clause can depend only on another — namely, "we are the reverse of this" — implied in the second *ἀλλ'*.

xi. 32.

Rec. T. *πιάσαι με θέλων* — desirous to apprehend me.

Rev. T. *πιάσαι με* — in order to take me.

The presence of *θέλων* is attested by **Σ**, D third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, all the cursives, the Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and John Damascene. It is wanting in B, D first hand, the Latin versions of D, E, F, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic, and Procopius. The

¹ See Humphry's *Commentary*.

revised reading has more of the appearance of being an abridgment of the apostle's language than the other has of being an exegetical extension of it. If his precise meaning had been what the revised rendering represents it to be, he would hardly have failed of using his favorite form of expression *εἰς τὸ πιάσαι με*, "in order to take me." But, in saying "wishing to take me," he would naturally give the infinitive without the preposition and the article.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. *ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*, — lest I should be exalted above measure.

Rev. T. *διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*, — wherefore, that I should not be exalted overmuch.

The received reading here is attested by D, E, K, L, P, all but one or two cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is adopted also by Tregelles and Tischendorf. The revised reading is that of S, A, B, F, G, 17, and Euthalius. Codex 67 strikes out *ἵνα*, and inserts *διὸ* instead. Dr. Hort says, "The documentary and transcriptional evidence place the genuineness of *διὸ* above doubt: its omission is a characteristic Western attempt to deal with a difficulty by excision."¹ This is plausible, no doubt, but it does not seem to be altogether satisfactory, even to Dr. Hort, who adds, a little farther on: "In all probability there is a corruption somewhere." And it is just here. Some early critic connected the five preceding words of the verse with verse 6 in this manner: "But I forbear, lest some one consider me something more than he sees, or hears from me, that I am, *even through the abundance of my revelations*." Then, in order suitably to connect what follows with this, he introduced *διὸ*: "*Wherefore*, lest I should be exalted overmuch, there was given me," etc. This very con-

struction appears in the Ethiopic Version. Lachmann, in like manner, places a full stop after *ἀποκαλύψεων*, "revelations," but connects that and the four preceding words with the close of verse 5, placing verse 6 within parentheses, — an exceedingly harsh and improbable construction, but one to which he was apparently driven by his faith in the Alexandrine and Vatican Codices. As in other cases, the original text here can be secured only by abandoning the testimony of our oldest Greek manuscripts, and accepting that of other, and in this instance more trustworthy, witnesses, — some of which date farther back than those manuscripts by one or more centuries. This, the American Committee of Revisers have done, though they retain "wherefore" in the margin, as the reading of "some ancient authorities."

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 120.

GALATIANS.

iii. 10.

Rec. T. γέγραπται γάρ Ἐπικατάρατος — for it is written, Cursed.

Rev. T. γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἐπικατάρατος — for it is written, Cursed.

The difference here relates solely to the text; the import of the readings is one and the same. The former is attested by K, L, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, Origen, Theodoret, and others; the latter by **N**, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, P, six cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Euthalius, Cyril, and John Damascene. This reading is strongly supported by uncial testimony, but it is not in accordance with the apostle's habitual mode of expressing himself. Not another instance can be found in all his writings in which he employs ὅτι as a mere sign of quotation after the words γέγραπται γάρ. In iv. 22, where the language is indirect, giving the substance but not the exact phraseology of what is quoted, of course ὅτι appears, just as its corresponding English word "that" appears in the rendering. But, in every instance of direct quotation, γάρ is followed by the citation without an intervening ὅτι. Just so where he employs the formula, λέγει γάρ ἡ γραφή, "For the Scripture saith." The only apparent exception to this is in Rom. ix. 17, where τῷ Φαραώ follows γραφή. This, however, is simply to mark just where the quotation begins. The same change (of inserting ὅτι after γάρ) was attempted by some early critic, on the apostle's language as reported by Luke in Acts xxiii. 5. This, however, was very properly disregarded by the Revisers, though it is attested as genuine by **N**, A, B, three cursives, and one form of Theophylact's Commentary, and is

adopted by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. The apostle's habitual mode of expressing himself declares strongly against the insertion of ὅτι. In verse 13 of this chapter we find a similar critical hand has been at work, omitting the γάρ after γέγραπται, and inserting before it the conjunction ὅτι in the sense of "for," or "because," — a combination that the apostle never employs. Yet the Revisers, following Westcott and Hort, adopt it. This reading is supported by A, B, C, D first hand, E first hand, F, G, two cursives, the Vulgate, the Ethiopic Version, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Eusebius, Euthalius, John Damascene, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and others; while the received reading, which is in accordance with the apostle's habit of writing, is attested by **N**, D and E as afterwards corrected, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Irenæus' Greek text as given by Theodoret, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and others. In both of these verses, the work wrought upon the text was not only supererogatory, but evidently depraving, and needs to be undone.

iv. 6.

Rec. T. εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν — into your hearts.

Rev. T. εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν — into our hearts.

The latter reading is attested by **N**, A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, fifteen cursives, several copies of the Vulgate, Origen according to his Latin interpreter, Athanasius, Basil, Euthalius, Cyril (against Nestorius), Tertullian, Hilary, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and others. The common reading has the support of D as afterwards corrected, E, K, L, most of the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, three or more manuscripts of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril (again against Nestorius as well as elsewhere), Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Augustine, and others. Those who accept the

testimony of the older uncials consider "*your hearts*" a modification of the original text in consequence of the preceding ἐστέ, "*ye are.*" But ἡμῶν is quite as likely to be an instance of an ever-recurring itacism, found in the oldest and best manuscripts. There is no similarity whatever between the use of ἡμῶν here and that in Rom. vii. 4; for there, the statement is not that "*ye should be joined to another*" "that *we* might bring forth fruit," but that "*Christ was raised from the dead that we* [all who believe in him] should bring forth fruit unto God." Nor can ἡμῶν as a genuine reading be accounted for on the fanciful supposition that it arose involuntarily from the apostle's own lively consciousness of the blessedness of adoption. The logical Paul could never have penned two such monstrous *non-sequiturs* as "Because ye are sons, God sent his Spirit into our hearts" . . . "so that thou art no longer a servant, but a son"; in other words, (1) "Because ye are sons, God has given us the spirit of sons," and (2) "Inasmuch as we have his Spirit, thou art a son." This certainly is not *the apostle's* style of arguing. The text speaks for itself, and pronounces "our" a palpably false reading. Notwithstanding the seemingly strong attestation in its favor, the other reading is in reality the more strongly supported, and should be accepted with unquestioning confidence.

iv. 7.

Rec. T. κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ. — an heir of God through Christ.

Rev. T. κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ. — an heir through God.

The first of these readings is attested by X's seventh-century emendator, C third hand, D, E, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Gothic Version, Didymus *De Trinitate*, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and John Damascene. The second is according to X first hand, A, B, C first hand, 17, the Latin versions of F and G, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Clement of

Alexandria, Basil, Didymus *De Trinitate* in another place, Cyril, Victorinus, Augustine, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Greek texts of F and G read διὰ Θεόν, i.e. an heir "because of God"; while the Armenian and the Roman Ethiopic Version read simply "an heir of God"; and other documents have other readings. The documentary evidence is not only greatly at variance in itself, but largely in conflict with intrinsic probability. If we read, with the Revisers, "an heir through God," and ask How, through God? the reply is, "Through the mercy of God."¹ But, if this had been the apostle's meaning, he would, no doubt, have so expressed it. If we ask further, An heir of whom? the implication is, of God. This makes the apostle virtually say, "And if a son, then an heir of God through the mercy of God." Can any one believe that this is what the apostle meant? or, if it is, that he would have expressed himself in this questionable manner? He had already said, in iii. 26, "Ye are all sons of God *through faith in Christ Jesus.*" And if sons through Christ, then heirs through Christ, as a matter of course. His aim is to show that it is *not through the law* that we become God's children and heirs, but through Christ, as we everywhere read. But this teaching, which continues down to verse 5, is lost in verse 7 of the R. V. in consequence of the new reading, though the allusion to the law is preserved in the word "bondservant" in the first half of the verse. The fault is plainly with the manuscripts and other witnesses that testify to the apostle's having written "an heir through God." Obviously some very early copyist, in transcribing, omitted the words Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, "of God through Christ," and the omission passed into other transcripts before being observed. (So plausible is this reading that Griesbach considered it as probably the true reading, though there is but one known extant document in support of it.) Readers, who subsequently noticed the omission, or some of them, sought to supply what

¹ Humphry, *Commentary*, p. 347.

was wanting by writing it either on the margin or in the text according to the best of their recollection, — one writing simply Θεοῦ; another, διὰ Θεοῦ; another, διὰ Θεόν; another, Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστόν; another, simply διὰ Χριστοῦ; another, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; another, taking the apostle's words from Rom. viii. 17, μὲν Θεοῦ συγκληρονόμος δὲ Χριστοῦ; and one manuscript (Codex 178), if no more, survives with the omitted words still unrestored; while the original reading — the one called for by the context — comes down to us through other channels.

iv. 23.

Rec. T. διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. — by promise.

Rev. T. δι' ἐπαγγελίας. — through promise.

The presence of the article is attested by B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, Origen four times, Theodoret, and others. It is wanting in $\aleph$, A, C, four cursives, Euthalius, Cyril, and John Damascene. The Revisers follow Tregelles and Westcott and Hort in rejecting the article; but Lachmann, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, and others very properly consider it a part of the text. It has reference to the particular promise recorded in Gen. xvii. 16, 19, in accordance with which Isaac was born; and it should not be omitted. Its omission grew out of the fact that the article is wanting before σάρκα in the previous clause, with which the phraseology here was made to correspond in this respect.

iv. 25.

Rec. T. τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ — For this Agar.

Rev. T. τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ — Now this Hagar.

The Revisers' δὲ is the reading of A, B, the Greek texts of D and E, four cursives, two manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Ambrosiaster. The common reading γὰρ is that of $\aleph$, C, F, G, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D

and E as well as of F and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions, Origen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Victorinus, Augustine, and others. It was originally overlooked and omitted probably in consequence of the juxtaposition of the syllables γὰρ Ἄγαρ, — the eye of the transcriber passing unconsciously from the one to the other before his pen had completed its work. After the omission, δὲ was inserted as a connecting link. Westcott and Hort adopt the latter; but Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, and others, adopt γὰρ. It is no doubt the true reading.

v. 1.

Rec. T. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὖν, ἣ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε, — Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

Rev. T. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε· στήκετε οὖν, — With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore.

In attestation of the η of the Received Text, we have D corrected by an early hand, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Latin version of D as well as of E, F, and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Marcion, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. Its omission is according to $\aleph$, A, B, C, D first hand, P, less than ten cursives, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and John Damascene. The order given in the Revised Text to the next two words, ἡμᾶς Χριστός, is attested by $\aleph$ first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, P, six or more cursives, Cyril, John Damascene, and others, and is probably the original order. This collocation of words indicates that the relative η was early dropped by an inattentive scribe on account of its being followed by ἡμᾶς, which begins with the same letter, — the omission of the duplicate of a letter being a slip of frequent occurrence, and in some instances the result of ignorance, among ancient

transcribers.¹ If we restore η , the Revisers' reading otherwise cannot reasonably be objected to. But the presence of this word necessitates a revision of their punctuation and rendering; thus: "Stand fast therefore in the freedom with which Christ hath made us free; and be not again entangled with a yoke of bondage."

V. 21.

Rec. T. $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$, — envyings, murders, drunkenness.

Rev. T. $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$, — envyings, drunkenness.

The received reading is attested by A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate with the exception of a single manuscript, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Ephraem Syrus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revised Text is supported by $\aleph$, B, five cursives, the twelfth-century Demidovian manuscript of the Vulgate, Clement of Alexandria, Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, Augustine, and Irenæus and Origen according to their Latin interpreters. The omitted word, in consequence of the resemblance between it and the one preceding, might very easily have dropped out of the text through *homoioleuton*. Its omission in this way is far more probable than that it was

¹ As examples of this, witness the omission of ν in $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Matt. i. 18, by $\aleph$, B, C, P, S, Z, Δ , and other documents, originating, perhaps, in the influence of $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\omega\varsigma$ in i. 1; also in $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in Matt. i. 20, by K, Δ ; in $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ in Matt. xii. 34, by Δ and a few cursives; in $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta$ in Mark xiv. 21, by A, L, Δ , 69, and other cursives; and in $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ in John i. 14, by A, B, Δ , and a number of cursives. In Matt. vi. 4, B, Δ , and John Damascene omit the verb η , "may be," after $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$. In Matt. vii. 14, L omits the article η after $\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta$. The omission of λ is of frequent occurrence. In like manner, in Matt. xiii. 16, D, M omit the article $\alpha\lambda$ after $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\iota$, "blessed." This omission of one or more letters preceded or followed by the same letter or letters is one of the commonest errors occurring in the old manuscripts.

introduced from Rom. i. 29. The fact that it appears in all the ancient versions, which would hardly be the case if it were a spurious reading, confirms this view.

vi. 2.

We must unite with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, and others, in regarding the future indicative $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, "ye shall fulfil," as the true reading here, instead of the aorist imperative $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, "fulfil ye." It certainly is more in keeping with the context. The apostle, after having said, "Bear ye one another's burdens; and so (since thus) ye *shall* fulfil the law of Christ," would very naturally run verse 4 into the same mould: "Let each prove his own work; and then he *shall* have his glorying in regard to himself, and not in regard to another." Besides, all the other imperatives in these verses are in the present; and the fact that this is in the aorist naturally awakens the suspicion that it is only the future indicative slightly changed. The future is attested by B, F, G, two cursives, four manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, Mai's Extracts, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Theodoret, Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, and others. The aorist imperative is the reading of $\aleph$, A, C, the Greek texts of D and E, K, L, N, P, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Clement, Basil, Ephraem Syrus, Didymus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and John Damascene. The presence of the future rather than the imperative in most of the versions strongly favors this as the original reading.

vi. 15.

Rec. T. $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή — For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision.

Rev. T. οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή — For neither circumcision.

The received reading here is attested by $\aleph$, A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic,

Woide's Thebaic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Platt's Ethiopic, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster. The Revisers' reading is that of only three Greek manuscripts, namely, B and the two cursives, 17 of the eleventh century, and 47 of nearly the same age, — the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Thebaic according to Griesbach's readings, the Venetian edition of the Armenian, the Roman Ethiopic, and the Gothic, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. But it is exceedingly improbable that the apostle, while combating Jewish prejudices, should say absolutely that circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, even though he had in the preceding chapter (verse 6) qualified the statement by prefacing it with the words "in Christ Jesus." By placing the observance and the non-observance of a God-given, hallowed, national ceremony unqualifiedly on one and the same level of inutility, it would look as if he regarded the Mosaic law a thing of no account. In the circumstances in which he was placed, it was but natural, therefore, that he should restrict his language here, as he had before restricted it, in order to prevent misapprehension, and a perversion of his words. Indeed, it was hardly possible for it to be otherwise. And the strong documentary evidence before us irresistibly leads to the conclusion that he really did do this. But some one, wishing to make the apostle's utterance more striking and perhaps somewhat startling, — or, possibly, merely considering the words "in Christ Jesus" altogether unnecessary, since they had been once given before, — struck them out. The Revisers' reading has, in fact, every appearance of being "a distinctively Syrian reading."

EPHESIANS.

i. 1.

To this verse is appended the marginal note, "Some very ancient authorities omit *in Ephesus*." To prevent this from being misleading, the Revisers should have added in substance Meyer's remark, "But the words are so decisively attested that they cannot be deprived of their right to a place in the text." These "very ancient authorities" are the original scribes of $\aleph$ and B. A corrector of the twelfth-century cursive 67 (whose corrections betray greater or less affinity with B), marks the expression as doubtful; while Origen and Basil the Great found it wanting in certain copies, and Marcion seems to have interpolated "at Laodicea" instead. On the other hand, the expression is found in all the other uncials and cursives, and even in these two uncials as afterward corrected, and in 67, as it came from the hand of its original scribe. The evidence of the versions, too, is unanimous for "in Ephesus." Several of the Fathers also, as Ignatius (according to the Syriac Version of his Epistle to the Ephesians, written two hundred years before $\aleph$ and B), Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others, attest the reading. Even Origen and Basil represent the epistle as written to the Ephesians. The omission of the expression appears to have arisen in this way: The letter, after being received at Ephesus, was probably duplicated so that a copy could be sent to one or more other churches in the immediate vicinity. From such a copy the words "in Ephesus" would naturally, if not necessarily, be omitted, and the blank be left without the name of any other place, as no

other name was inserted by the writer. Copies taken from such a copy would naturally appear with a blank where copies made directly from the autograph, but not specially intended for other churches, would have the apostle's words "in Ephesus." The Colossians were charged (Col. iv. 16) by the apostle himself to have his letter to them read by the church at Laodicea, and to see that they obtained from the Laodiceans another letter of his, or a copy of it. The letter thus referred to may have been this Epistle to the Ephesians, which, or a copy of which, the Ephesians had been verbally instructed by Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 22), when he delivered the letter to them, to send to the church at Laodicea. Hence, perhaps, Marcion, who may have obtained, in the next century, a copy more or less directly from some member of the Laodicean Church, calls it the Epistle to the Laodiceans. That Paul inserted the words "in Ephesus" is evident. The language, "to the saints that are, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," not only differs from his usual style of address, but misrepresents him. Elsewhere, after the expression "to the saints that are," he invariably adds words denoting *where* they are; as, "in Rome," "in Corinth," "in Philippi." This naturally leads us to conclude that here he added "in Ephesus." If he did not, the words can legitimately mean only, "to the saints that are also believers in Christ,"—as if any saints, in his use of the word, were not of necessity believers in Christ. The apostle could not have given utterance to such an idea. Basil's assumption that "saints that are" is the correct reading, and that the meaning is "saints that are saints," is a mere conceit, alike unworthy of the apostle and unsuited to the connection.—The marginal note is really uncalled for. As it stands, it is more harmful than otherwise. Ordinary readers, for whom, principally, the revision was or should have been designed, are liable to be misled by it.

i. 14.

Rec. T. τῷ Πνεύματι . . . τῷ Ἀγίῳ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἀρραβὼν— that Holy Spirit . . . which is the earnest.

Rev. T. τῷ Πνεύματι . . . τῷ Ἀγίῳ, ὁ ἐστὶν ἀρραβὼν—the Holy Spirit . . . which is an earnest.

The received reading ὃς has the support of $\aleph$, D, E, K, most of the cursives, Didymus, Chrysostom in his comment, Theodoret, John Damascene, Photius, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Victorinus, and others. The Revisers' ὁ is the reading of A, B, F, G, L, fifteen cursives, Athanasius, Euthalius, Chrysostom in the text, and Cyril. Lachmann, like the Revisers, adopts this as the true reading. Tischendorf adopts ὃς. Tregelles also reads ὃς, but places ὁ in the margin; while Westcott and Hort place ὁ in the text, and ὃς in the margin. Ὅς is probably the original and true reading, early set aside by some critical hand for ὁ, on account of the gender of the antecedent, Πνεῦμα, "Spirit." The apostle, in employing the masculine, conforms the gender of the relative to that of the predicate noun in its own clause, namely, ἀρραβὼν, "an earnest," or pledge. In ii. 13, the relative represents a plural noun, θλίψεις, "tribulations"; but, inasmuch as the predicate nominative is in the singular, the relative ἡ τις is in the singular also, to agree in *number* with δόξα, "glory." In vi. 17, the noun following in the predicate is a neuter, ῥῆμα, "a word"; hence the relative is neuter, though it refers back to the feminine μακαίρα, "sword." In 1 Tim. iii. 15, the noun in the predicate of the relative clause is a feminine, ἐκκλησία, "the church," and the relative is accordingly ἡ τις, though the antecedent is a masculine, οἱ κω. On the same principle, in Gal. iii. 16, the relative is ὃς, "who,"—the following noun being Χριστός, "Christ," though the antecedent is a neuter, σπέρμα, "seed." The same is true in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where the relative (which appears in some documents as ὁ and in others as Θεός), though representing the neuter noun, μυστήριον, "mystery," immediately preceding, is

unquestionably masculine, because the one meant by *μυστήριον*, and spoken of in what follows, is Christ, precisely as in Col. i. 27. (See Note on 1 Tim. iii. 16.) This is the apostle's habitual mode of writing. Instead of supposing that he departed from it in this instance, it is more reasonable and just to conclude that the neuter *ὁ* is the work of another, who thought he had discovered an error, and desired to correct it.

i. 15.

Rec. T. *καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας*—and love unto all.

Rev. T. *καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας*—and which *ye shew* toward all.

The common reading, *τὴν ἀγάπην*, is vouched for by the seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, D, E, F, G, K, L, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Ephraem Syrus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Augustine in one of his epistles, Ambrosiaster, and others. The words are wanting in *Σ* first hand, A, B, P, 17, Origen, Cyril in another treatise, Jerome, and Augustine on Predestination. They were, no doubt, omitted in consequence of the recurrence of *τὴν*,—the eye of a copyist having passed from one to the other, leaving *ἀγάπην* and one of the articles unnoticed and unwritten. The sentence as revised indicates that something is wanting. Properly translated, it reads: "Wherefore I also, having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, *and* [. . .] *which* ye have toward all the saints, cease not to give thanks," etc. This double use of connectives without any substantive between them, though common enough with the modern school-boy, is something that was unknown to manly writers of Greek in the apostle's day. In addition to this, the fact that all the versions contain the omitted words leaves no room to doubt their genuineness. It is but justice to the American Committee of Revisers to say that they did not approve of the change in the text.

v. 2.

Rec. T. *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*—as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.

Rev. T. *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ὑμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*—even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us.

It is altogether improbable that the apostle Paul ever dictated or penned words according to this revised reading. There was no call for such writing on his part. And it is unjust to represent him as having thus expressed himself,—especially when the source of such incoherence is obvious. The apostle wrote, "Be followers of God as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ loved us, and gave himself up for us." But some copyist, governed by the person of the preceding verbs, carelessly wrote *ὑμᾶς*, "you," for *ἡμᾶς*, "us," leaving the second "us" unchanged. And so it passed into a number of copies, giving this reading more or less currency. Afterwards, some corrector tried his pen. But, instead of changing the "you" back to "us," he altered the second "us" to "you." Thus, at least three different classes of manuscripts came into use;—the original reading "us . . . us"; the first departure therefrom reading "you . . . us"; and the second departure "you . . . you." This accounts for the preponderance of documentary attestation in support of the second "us"; while the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers are nearly equally divided between "us" and "you" after "loved."

v. 30.

Rec. T. *μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ*.—we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

Rev. T. *μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*.—we are members of his body.

The entire reading, as given in the Received Text, is attested by *Σ*'s seventh-century corrector, D, E, F, G, L, P, nearly

every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, and others. Irenæus, speaking concerning what the Revisers have omitted, states expressly that the apostle "says this, not of some spiritual and invisible man, for a spirit has neither bones nor flesh, but of a distribution (of the members) similar to what is found in the human body, which consists of flesh, nerves, and bones." Whatever may be thought as to the correctness of this comment, it proves that Irenæus, A.D. 178, accepted the words as genuine. Their omission, however, is according to $\times$ first hand, A, B, 17, 67 second hand, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, Methodius, and Euthalius. Those who reject the words consider them as introduced from Gen. ii. 23. But, if they had been thus introduced, they would read *ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, as in the Septuagint, and not in the inverted order in which they stand here. Besides, no one would think of making such an addition as "out of his flesh and out of his bones," to language apparently as complete as "We are members of his body"; especially when the glorified body of Christ has neither flesh nor bones, and the addition would naturally appear not only unnecessary but misapplied. It was rather on this account that the words were omitted, — because their import was enigmatical, and they had the appearance of being irrelevant, — a mode of dealing with obscure and difficult expressions by no means uncommon in a certain class of documents. In writing these words, no doubt, the apostle had in mind the record respecting Eve as formed from Adam's bones and flesh. The allusion, however, was not made under the idea that believers in Christ are in any sense taken from him and made his, as Eve was from Adam. It was simply to express the thought that the relation subsisting between Christ and his church is as close and intimate as if the latter had been taken and formed from his flesh and from his bones, as Eve was from Adam's. And so the apostle himself teaches

us by prefixing the words, "even as Christ also [nourisheth and cherisheth] the church"; and adding immediately after, "This is a great mystery (or hidden truth); but I am speaking concerning Christ and the church." (Verse 32.) The words, properly rendered, would read, "We are [so to speak] members of his body, out of his flesh and out of his bones." The language, of course, is figurative, and must be so interpreted, without subjecting it to tension or violence.

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 1.

THE change made by the Revisers in this verse from *τινά* to *τις* before *σπλάγχνα*, "tender mercies," was simply for its own sake, not in order to prepare the text for a correct English rendering. The word may be "overwhelmingly" supported by documentary evidence, — **Σ**, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, more than fifty cursives, Euthalius, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and Œcumenius; but it is only the result of an early thoughtless repetition of the *τις* occurring twice just before. The same blunder was perpetrated in changing *τὶ* to *τις* before *παραμύθιον*, "comfort," A. V., "consolation," R. V., the second of the four nouns here accompanied by this word, — a blunder which still appears in D first hand, L, 17, 46, 73, 137, and twelve or more cursives, and in Theodoret and Theophylact. Though *τις σπλάγχνα* is ungrammatical Greek, the change, like hundreds of other changes, does not affect the English text in the least. Those who defend this reading assume that the combined testimony of certain ancient manuscripts is unimpeachable, and that the apostle employed *τις* in reference to the abstract idea of compassion embodied in *σπλάγχνα*, a neuter plural! But Meyer shows conclusively that this latter assumption is altogether untenable. In no one of the other eight instances in which the apostle employs *σπλάγχνα*, does he treat it as a singular by connecting with it an article or an adjective in the singular. If *τις* is a copyist's blunder, as we make no question it is (and it is easily accounted for as such), "How," say those who believe in the infallibility of copyists rather than

in the apostle's ability to write Greek correctly, "how could such an ungrammatical blunder, if not genuine, be so widely circulated?" We answer, In precisely the same way that it is now continued in circulation by those who believe it to be the true reading, — by holding to it, and handing it down to others. Or, — to give our answer in a little different form, — it is just as the false reading in Matt. xxiii. 24, "strain *at* a gnat," has been handed down through nearly three centuries of intelligent printers and editors, whose reverence for the letter of the A. V. has withheld them from correcting it, though Tyndale has it "strayne out," and King James's Revisers could not, in place of it, have sent to the press such a reading as "strain at." The Greek word *δινάζειν* means to strain off, or out, through a sieve, cloth, filter, or by some other means; and that any body of Greek scholars should be capable of translating it "strain at," is utterly incredible. Any one familiar with the mistakes of copyists, and the mechanical way in which copying is generally done, should be the last to ask how such blunders can be perpetuated, and the first to do the original writer the justice of believing that he did not write what he was morally and intellectually incapable of having written.

iii. 13.

Rec. T. *ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι*. — I count not myself to have apprehended.

Rev. T. *ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὕτω λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι*. — I count not myself yet to have apprehended.

The *οὐ*, of the Received Text and the Revisers' margin, is attested by B, D corrected by a second or third hand, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Latin version of D as well as those of E, F, and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, Origen, Chrysostom twice, Tertullian, Victorinus, and Jerome on Ezekiel. *Οὕτω* is vouched for by **Σ**, A, the Greek text of D, P, 17, and

about forty other cursives, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, in another οὐδέπω, and in yet another οὐ as just noted, Theodoret, the Paschal Chronicle, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, Jerome against Pelagius, and others. But this reading was introduced in consequence of the repeated "already," of verse 12. To have been genuine, it should have preceded, not λογίζομαι, but κατειληφέναι. As it stands, it belongs to the former, and should be taken with it, making the clause read, "I do not *yet consider* myself to have apprehended"; whereas the Revisers improperly connect it with the latter by rendering the clause, "I count not myself *yet to have apprehended*." It is true, this rendering is called for by the statement, "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect," in verse 12; but the position of οὐπω forbids it. This, however, is to be expected, as the word is merely a modification of οὐ, which belongs to λογίζομαι.

iv. 23.

The Revisers omit "Amen" at the close of this verse; and yet the documentary evidence preponderates in its favor. In support of it, we have **Σ**, A (C would doubtless be found here if not defective), D, E, K, L, P, every cursive but one, a seventh-century fragment of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. The omission is found only in B, F, G, one cursive, 47, the Thebaic, the only version except the Latin versions of F and G, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and Victorinus. We do not understand why the word should be omitted here, yet retained at the close of 1 Cor. xvi. 24, when the testimony, for and against, in the two instances is as nearly identical as can well be.

COLOSSIANS.

i. 7.

Rec. T. πιστός ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, — for you a faithful minister of Christ.

Rev. T. πιστός ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, — a faithful minister of Christ on our behalf.

The ὑμῶν of the Received Text and the Revisers' margin is attested by the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, C, D second hand, E, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D and F as well as that of E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Sedulius, Ambrosiaster, and others. The ἡμῶν, of the Revised Text, is less strongly attested by **Σ** first hand, A, B, the Greek text of F, and of D according to the original scribe, G, ten cursives, and only the Latin translation of G among all the versions. It was carelessly introduced in place of ὑμῶν in consequence of following so closely after the preceding ἡμῶν. That it is a false reading is obvious from iv. 12, 13: "Epaphras, who is one of you . . . always striving for you (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, as here), in his prayers, etc. . . . he hath much labor for you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν again), etc. The verse might perhaps be more faithfully expressed in English thus: "Even as ye learned from Epaphras our beloved fellow-servant, who is faithful on your behalf as a minister of Christ." The apostle seems to have been desirous of assuring the brethren at Colosse of Epaphras' well-doing and faithfulness on their behalf while earnestly laboring with him in his imprisonment.

i. 12.

The marginal reading, ὑμᾶς, "you," in place of "us" in the clause, "who hath made us meet to be partakers" etc., is too feebly attested to merit consideration. It crept in through some transcriber's carelessness under the influence of the preceding context, as is evident from a comparison of this verse with verses 13, 14. It is attested only by **S**, B, half a dozen cursives, two copies of the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, Didymus, Theophylact, and Ambrosiaster. On Westcott and Hort's principles, it cannot safely be rejected. Hence its appearance in the margin.—It may be added that D, F, G, and a few other documents, read here, "who *hath called* us to be" etc., while B alone reads, "who *hath called and made you meet* to be" etc.,—a reading, which, if found in any other manuscript, Dr. Hort would call a "conflation."

i. 21.

The marginal note assures the reader that, instead of "hath he reconciled," "some ancient authorities read, *ye have been reconciled*." The only known ancient document that reads ἀποκατηλλάγητε, "ye were (or have been) reconciled," is B. Codex D first hand, G, the Greek text of F, the Latin versions of D, E, and G, Mai's Extracts, the Gothic Version, Ambrosiaster, and possibly Irenæus, have the nominative plural of the second aorist passive participle, ἀποκαταλλαγέντες, "having been reconciled,"—a reading that is by no means suited to the connection. The reading of B evidently arose from *beginning a sentence* with νυνί, under the influence of the preceding words, "you being in time *past* alienated" etc. This was thought to require the reading, "But *now ye have been* reconciled" etc.,—which throws the construction out of harmony with what follows: "that *he* might present you" etc. The reading of the text, "he hath reconciled," points back to a fulfilment of God's

purpose as expressed by the aorist active, ἀποκαταλλάξαι, "to reconcile," in verse 20, and seems to be, beyond doubt, what the apostle wrote. On account of his involved and parenthetical language, which to himself was perfectly clear as well as natural, many and perhaps most commentators have labored over the construction in this verse. But a moment's careful examination of his words ought to suffice to make them clear to every one. Throughout this passage (verses 19–22) the leading subject of discourse is "the Father," as in verses 12, 13. The latter half of verse 20 is parenthetical, placing an interjected thought, that naturally presented itself, between the verb "reconcile," in verse 20, and "even you," a part of its object, in verse 21. With these points in view, the passage may be rendered, "For it pleased the Father, in him [Christ] to have all fulness dwell, and through him to reconcile all things to himself [the Father] (having made peace through him by means of the blood of his cross, whether as to things upon earth or things in heaven), even you, who were once alienated and enemies by your inclination for evil works. But now he [the Father] hath reconciled (you) by the body of his [Christ's] flesh, through his death, that he [the Father] might present you holy, and without a blemish, and unreprouvable in his [Christ's] presence." (Compare 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; iv. 14; xi. 2; Eph. v. 25–27; Jude 24, 25.)

i. 27.

Rec. T. ὃς ἐστι Χριστός — which is Christ.

Rev. T. ὃ ἐστι Χριστός — which is Christ.

The first of these readings is attested by **S**, C, D, E, K, L, most of the cursives, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, and John of Damascus; the last, by A, B, F, G, P, 17, 47, and 67 second hand. *O was, no doubt, originally introduced to make the gender of the relative the same as that of its antecedent τοῦ μυστηρίου, "the mystery,"—a change

which was favored, and possibly thought to be required, by the construction σώματος ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία in verse 24. But the apostle's usual mode of writing calls for the masculine, because of the predicate noun, Χριστός, which it represents, and which embodied an idea of far greater weight in his mind than μυστήριον, and would thus naturally lead him to write the masculine instead of the neuter. (See Note on Eph. i. 14.) While Lachmann and Westcott and Hort adopt ὃ (though the latter place ὃς in the margin as a secondary and possibly genuine reading), Griesbach, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Meyer, and other editors follow the Received Text.

ii. 7.

Rec. T. περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding therein with thanksgiving.

Rev. T. περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding in thanksgiving.

The words ἐν αὐτῇ omitted from the text by the Revisers, are found in B, D third hand, E, K, L, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Ambrosiaster. They are wanting in **Σ** first hand, A, C, 17, and ten or twelve other cursives, a few copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, Euthalius, and others. The presence of the pronoun and its preposition evidently gave trouble to early readers and scribes on account of the ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ following immediately after. This led some to omit the words. Others, instead of omitting them, took them to be a transcriptional error for ἐν αὐτῷ, employed by the apostle in the former part of the verse. Hence the appearance of this phrase in **Σ** as corrected by a seventh-century reader, D first hand, the Vulgate, and other documents. This reading is too feebly attested to be supposed for a moment to be the original reading, from which ἐν αὐτῇ may have sprung. On the contrary, the presence of ἐν αὐτῇ tends indirectly to prove that ἐν αὐτῇ is a part of the original

text, set aside for what was incorrectly considered the true reading. Others, while retaining ἐν αὐτῇ, omitted ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, — a reading preserved to us in Codex P, which constitutes an additional witness in favor of ἐν αὐτῇ. The sentence without these words really seems to stand in no need of any addition. And certainly no reader or scribe would have been tempted to insert them if they had not been genuine. When we grasp the apostle's meaning, — not "abounding in *the* faith," but abounding *in faith* (that in which he would have them βεβαυμένοι, "made firm,") with thanksgiving, — we see a propriety, a special force in the exhortation, which the bare words "abounding in thanksgiving" do not possess.

ii. 18.

Rec. T. ἀ μὴ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, — intruding into those things which he hath not seen.

Rev. T. ἀ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, — dwelling in the things which he hath seen.

The negative, which the Revisers have relegated to the margin, is supported by the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, C, D second and third hands, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, Origen in one edition of his works, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster according to one edition, Augustine, and Jerome. The μὴ is wanting in **Σ** first hand, A, B, D first hand, 17, 28, 67 second hand, Mai's Extracts, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, Origen in other editions, Lucifer, *Questiones ex utroque Testamento*, and Ambrosiaster according to another edition. There is nothing in the immediate connection to indicate that either the presence or the absence of μὴ is really due to transcriptional error. It is due rather to a misapprehension of the import of a part of the context. If the word is genuine, its absence in some manuscripts is owing originally to intentional omission, from being considered incompatible with the apostle's

meaning. If spurious, its presence is due to the opposite consideration that it is essential to the expression of the apostle's thought, and that it was really inserted by him, but in some way, in transcribing, had been omitted. From a mere transcriptional point of view, the latter is less credible than the former; that is, on this ground, the probability is rather in favor of the genuineness of the negative than otherwise. And when we look at the words themselves, this probability increases. Ἐμβατεύων, nowhere else used in the New Testament, primarily means stepping in or on, as on an island or into any territory; hence, entering on or coming into possession of; and, by an easy transition, laying claim to, — a meaning necessarily implied in the act of taking possession of. This claim may be just or unjust. That is not determined by the word itself, but by the context. If the apostle's meaning here were, as some suppose, simply entering upon or into, there is no probability that he would have gone so far out of his usual and natural course as to say Ἐμβατεύων instead of εἰσελθών; or if it were, as the Revisers have it, "dwelling in," that he would have used this word instead of ἐνοικῶν. Besides this, the employment by the apostle of the simple ὥρακεν to denote the seeing of things in vision or by means of visions is altogether incredible. And yet it must be so taken if the negative is discarded. Grimm, in his Lexicon, under the word Ἐμβατεύω, says, "If we expunge μὴ, we must render [the clause], 'going into curious and subtile speculation about things which he *has seen in visions granted him,*'" — which the Revisers have condensed into "dwelling in the things which he hath seen," though the import of their words is by no means clear apart from Grimm's or some similar paraphrase, like Humphry's, "asserting a knowledge of *things supernatural* which he has seen." This obscurity, coupled with the unnatural use to which some of the words need to be put in case the negative is omitted, forms a strong presumption that the omission is unwarranted. With the negative, the text is natural, easy, and commends itself as genuine: "Let no

one" divert you from your steadfastness and constancy in following Christ by placing any obstacle in your way, and so "beguile you of your reward" — the crown of life — "seeking to do it under the guise of humility and angel-worship, *laying claim to what he has not seen*, vainly puffed up," etc.

iii. 6.

The marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities omit *upon the sons of disobedience*," and refers to Eph. v. 6, as if these words might have been introduced from that verse. Eph. ii. 2, where the apostle has the expression, "in the children of disobedience," might also have been referred to. The fact that a phrase or expression appears (possibly more than once) in a certain epistle, and again in another epistle written at the same time by the same person, is no reason why we should question its genuineness in one of those epistles any more than we should its genuineness the second or the third time it might appear in one and the same epistle, even though the testimony of a few ancient documents may seem to indicate that it is a false reading. The witnesses here referred to in the words "*some ancient authorities*" are one Greek manuscript, B, and two versions, the Thebaic and the Roman Ethiopic, — whose unsupported testimony in favor of any peculiar reading may be considered *prima-facie* evidence against its genuineness. In this instance, they are supported by Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, and Ambrosiaster. This, however, is not enough to prove the words omitted by them to be no part of the original text. The expression ἐν οἷς, which follows, is the apostle's own protest against the mutilation of his language. This expression does not mean "in the which," as the A. V., the R. V., and others make it mean, as if it referred to the sins specified in verse 5. It refers, as the same expression does in Eph. ii. 3 (where the same thought is expressed), to "the sons of disobedience" immediately preceding, and means "among whom,"

as the Revisers have it in their margin; for the apostle hardly meant to reason in a circle, and say, "*in which things* ye also formerly walked, when ye lived *in those things*." Verse 7, following on after the mention of "the sons of disobedience," should read, "*Among whom* ye also once walked, when ye were living (or, were alive) in those things." Now, if we omit the phrase "upon the sons of disobedience," as B and its frequent ally in error, the Thebaic Version, would have us do, we lose the true antecedent of οἷς, and are compelled to make the apostle speak unlike himself, and say what he had no thought of saying. (Compare Eph. ii. 3.) Though this phrase is placed in brackets by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf as a result of one of his false principles of criticism, and also by Westcott and Hort through their partiality for B, its omission is a palpable error, not worthy of a moment's consideration as a possibly genuine reading.

iv. 15.

Rec. T. τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν. — the church which is in his house.

Rev. T. τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. — the church that is in their house.

The common reading, "his house," is attested by D, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The revised reading, "their house," is that of **Σ**, A, C, P, eight cursives, one copy of the Arabic Version, and Euthalius. In addition to these readings is another, "her house," inserted in the Revisers' margin in deference to Westcott and Hort, who adopt it in their own text in preference to either of the other two. This is supported only by B, the marginal reading of the twelfth-century cursive 67, and the Philoxenian Syriac Version, — unless the *ejus* of the Vulgate is to be taken as standing for

"her" rather than for "his." This, however, can hardly be conceded, since the Latin versions as a rule side with D, and the Latin versions of D, E, F, and G all translate αὐτοῦ by *ejus*, "his." The common reading is, no doubt, the original one. It has in its favor the testimony of the Peshito Syriac and Memphitic Versions, which dates back at least to the close of the second century, and is fully one hundred and fifty years earlier than the earliest evidence in support of either of the other readings. Besides this, it is altogether improbable that Νυμφαν represents the Doric feminine Νύμφα. But an early reader, taking it as a feminine name, considered αὐτοῦ an error, and accordingly changed it to αὐτῆς, "her." Hence the reading of B. The revised reading, however, originated probably as a simple, perfectly natural, and by no means uncommon transcriptional error, — the scribe's thoughts for the moment dwelling on the idea of Nymphas' household, rather than having Nymphas himself in view. Hence "their house" instead of "his house." That αὐτῶν is the genuine reading, and refers back to "the brethren in Laodicea," including Nymphas, as if they all formed one family and lived in the same house, and the "church that was in their house" embraced yet others, is absurd. What, then, is to be gained by changing the plain, strongly supported, and most probably genuine reading, "his house," to the absurd and obviously incorrect reading, "their house," or even to "her house," which is both very improbable and very feebly attested?

I THESSALONIANS.

i. 2.

Rec. T. *μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμενοι* — making mention of you.

Rev. T. *μνείαν ποιοῦμενοι* — making mention of you.

The pronoun, as in the Received Text, is found in **Σ** corrected by its seventh-century emendator, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, a fragment of a seventh-century copy of the Old Latin Version, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is wanting in **Σ** first hand, A, B, 17, 67 second hand, 122 first hand, a few copies of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and Euthalius; and was probably inconsiderately regarded by an early scribe as an improper repetition of the word employed just before, — *περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμενοι*, — the remaining words being understood to mean, "making mention of you all," by considering *περὶ* equivalent to our "of," "spake of him," as in Luke ii. 38, and elsewhere frequently. To one taking this view of the words, the second *ὑμῶν* would of course appear simply as a previous transcriber's error that ought to be corrected. Hence its omission. The same thing was undoubtedly done in Eph. i. 16, where the apostle's language is very similar, and where the witnesses are in like manner divided in regard to the reading, though somewhat more strongly arrayed in favor of the omission than here. Yet in both instances a proper understanding of the apostle's meaning and construction calls for *ὑμῶν* after as well as before *μνείαν*, as the Revisers' rendering shows.

i. 10.

Rec. T. *ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, — whom he raised from the dead.

Rev. T. *ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, — whom he raised from the dead.

The omission of the article is in accordance with the testimony of A, C, K, a large minority of the cursives, the Armenian Version, Eusebius, and Œcumenius. Its presence is attested by **Σ**, B, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Theophylact. The presence or the absence of the article, especially when it does not in the least affect the translation, may seem to be a point of but little or no moment. And so, no doubt, it often is; but not in this instance. For the apostle, in common with most other New-Testament writers, makes a nice distinction in the use of the article in connection with the plural *νεκροί*, "dead." When he employs this word in reference to a particular class or portion of mankind whom he calls "dead," he invariably connects the article with it.¹ But, when he refers to the dead in general, he uses *νεκροί* without the article. This seems to be the use that the apostle here makes of the word, as it evidently is in Rom. iv. 24, vi. 4, 9, and in every other place where he speaks of Christ as "raised from the dead." In the light of these facts, it seems as if A, C, and the other witnesses who unite with them are in the right, while the Revisers and others

¹ See 1 Cor. xv. 35, 42, 52, that is, the righteous dead; 2 Cor. i. 9, those that are given up for dead, who in the eyes of others are virtually dead; Eph. v. 14, the morally dead; Col. i. 18, the dead in Paradise, the righteous dead, as explained by 1 Cor. xv. 20, "the first fruits of them that have fallen asleep," who constitute only a portion of the *νεκρῶν* generally, mentioned just before; and 1 Thess. iv. 16. Even here belongs Rom. iv. 17, meaning the inefficient, whether morally or physically so, with a direct reference in the context to the latter class. Here, too, belongs 1 Cor. xv. 29, where *νεκροί* denotes the dead in general, but *οἱ νεκροί* those who have united themselves by faith to a crucified Saviour, and with him are dead to sin, to the world, etc.

who follow **N**, B, D, and their fellow witnesses misrepresent the apostle by inserting the article. We hold to the Received Text therefore, as presenting the apostle's words without being "added unto." Similar instances of tampering with his language are found elsewhere. Thus, in 1 Cor. xv. 15, F and G insert the article before νεκροί, where all other known documents are without it. In verse 20, in which the apostle speaks of Christ as raised from the dead, F and G, as in verse 15, insert the article, in which they are joined by John Damascene. In Eph. i. 20, where the apostle again speaks of Christ as raised from the dead, Codex L, about twenty-five cursives, and Eusebius insert the article. In Phil. iii. 11, the Received Text incorrectly reads, with K, L, most of the cursives, the Memphitic and Armenian Versions, Theodoret, and Theophylact, ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν instead of ἐκ νεκρῶν. And again, in Col. ii. 12, B, D, E, F, G, 17, and most of the other cursives, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others have the same reading instead of the apostle's anarthrous νεκρῶν. — We have been thus full and explicit on this point, so that the reader may understand the facts in reference to the apostle's use of this word as connected with the article.

ii. 12.

Rec. T. Θεοῦ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς — God, who hath called you.

Rev. T. Θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς — God, who calleth you.

The aorist participle of the Received Text, which the Revisers have thrown into the margin, is attested by **N**, A, six cursives, the Latin version of F, Mai's Extracts, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Bashmuric, the Gothic, the Armenian, Chrysostom in his first citation of the passage, Theodoret, and Ambrosiaster. The present, of the Revised Text, is the reading of B, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, and G, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom in

two subsequent citations, Euthalius, John Damascene, and others. The fact that nearly all the ancient versions support the first of these readings, and one of them doing this against its own Greek text, testifies strongly to its genuineness. Another fact pointing in the same direction is, that those whom the apostle is addressing are Christians, persons whom he calls (i. 4) "brethren beloved of God." A third fact is, that the apostle goes on immediately to say, "And for this reason — that is, not because God is calling you, but because he has called you — we thank him without ceasing that, *when ye heard* the gospel from us, ye *regarded* it not as the word of man, but as the word of God," etc. That is, he thanks God continually for something that has already occurred. In 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14, he writes, "God chose you from the beginning *unto* salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; *unto which* he called you by our gospel *for* the attainment of the *glory* of our Lord Jesus Christ." He here uses the preposition *eis* in what seems to be two senses, — first, as meaning "unto," and immediately after as meaning "for," — *unto* salvation, *for* glory. So, in the verse before us (though he does not repeat the preposition because the two meanings would naturally present themselves to his Greek readers in his use of the word), his meaning is, "who hath called you *into* his kingdom and *unto* glory"; or, as Tyndale and the A. V. have very well expressed it, simply "*unto*, his kingdom and glory"; as it is also expressed in 1 Pet. v. 10. But, as the glory referred to was evidently something not yet attained by the Thessalonians, the apostle's meaning failed of being grasped by some of his early readers. Hence it was thought necessary to change the aorist participle to the present, making the clause read, "who is calling you unto his kingdom and glory," as something yet future. And possibly this was aided by the apostle's assurance in v. 24, "Faithful is he that *calleth* you, who also will do it." The common reading is on the whole the more strongly attested, and should not be set aside.

iii. 2.

The marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities read, *fellow-worker with God*"; i.e. in place of the A. V.'s "minister of God, and our fellow-laborer," and the R. V.'s "God's minister." This reading is attested only by D first hand, the Latin versions of D and E, and Ambrosiaster. Nevertheless it seems to be the original and true reading, and is so considered by Griesbach, Lachmann, Alford, Ellicott, and others. (Compare 1 Cor. iii. 9.) The various readings — and there are several of them — can hardly be accounted for satisfactorily on any other supposition. But, if we take "a fellow-worker with God" to be what the apostle wrote, the other readings appear at once as devices to obviate the seeming difficulty presented by this phrase. Thus, — to instance some of them, — B and the Armenian Version suppress "of God," making the words read, "Timothy, our brother and a fellow-worker in the gospel." $\aleph$, A, P, the margin of 67, three other cursives, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Bashmuric, Gothic, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, Basil, Euthalius, and Pelagius substitute "minister" for "colaborer," or "fellow-worker," giving the Revisers' reading, "a minister of God." E, F, G, and 17 combine the two, making "a minister and co-laborer of God"; while the text of the A. V., following D third hand, E second hand, K, L, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others, read "a minister of God, and our fellow-laborer."

iv. 8.

Rec. T. τὸν καὶ δόντα — who hath also given.

Rev. T. τὸν διδόντα — who giveth.

The καὶ is attested by $\aleph$, D first hand, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Clement, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Œcumenius, Pelagius, and others. It is omitted by A, B, D second and third

hands, E, ten cursives, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Origen, Athanasius, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ambrosiaster, and others. The aorist participle δόντα is attested by the seventh-century corrector of $\aleph$, A, K, L, most of the cursives, Clement, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The present of the Revised Text, has the support of $\aleph$ first hand, B, D, E, F, G, seven or eight cursives, Origen, Athanasius, and Didymus. Both of these new readings — the omission of καὶ (which is not approved by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and other modern editors), and the adoption of the present participle instead of the aorist — fail to commend themselves as genuine readings. It seems hardly possible that the conjunction should have got into the text and obtained so extensive a circulation, if it had not been placed there by the original writer. The reason of its omission, however, is obvious. It was thought to connect the words following it with the preceding part of the verse. But, as there was no propriety in such a use of καὶ, it was dropped. At the same time, the participle was changed to the present, so as to correspond grammatically with the preceding presents, ἀθετοῦν, "rejecting," and ἀθετεῖ, "rejecteth." The fact, however, that the present, "who giveth," makes "unto you" a feeble, and indeed questionable ending for the verse, if it does not render it absolutely superfluous, is an indication of its spuriousness; whereas the aorist participle renders "unto you" or "unto us" necessary, while it naturally corresponds in time with ἐκάλεισεν, "called," in verse 7, to which the conjunction "also" refers: "God *called* us . . . who *hath* also *given*" etc.

v. 4.

"Some ancient authorities read *as thieves*." Only A, B, and the Memphitic Version however; which Lachmann and Westcott and Hort follow as if it were the true reading. But it originated plainly enough in error, and not only misrepresents

the apostle, but is unsuited to the context. It makes the sentence read "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as (one might overtake) thieves"; — not, "as thieves overtake others"; for κλέπτας, "thieves," is in the accusative, — a transcriptional error for κλέπτης, "a thief," — and, as such, must be the object of some verb. But the apostle leaves us in no doubt as to what he wrote. In verse 2, he says, "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief (cometh) in the night"; *i.e.* unexpectedly. Then, in verse 4, referring back to this, he says, "Ye are *not in darkness*, that that day should overtake you *as a thief*" overtakes people; *i.e.* unexpectedly. If certain textual critics were not apparently infatuated with the idea that the New Testament is to be found only in two or three, or, at most, five of the oldest manuscripts, we should not have such monstrosities and palpably false readings again and again thrust before us for acceptance as possibly genuine portions of the text.

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii. 3.

"THE man of lawlessness" is noted in the margin as the reading of "many ancient authorities" instead of "the man of sin." It is the reading of Σ , B, ten cursives, the Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions, Origen, Euthalius, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster; and, for obvious reasons, is adopted by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. The common reading, which is followed by Lachmann, Alford, Ellicott, and others, is that of A, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Augustine. There need be no doubt as to whether the reading of the text is the true one. It is unlike anything elsewhere found in the apostle's writings, and would hardly have got into the text if it had not been genuine. But "the man of lawlessness," meaning the lawless man, would very naturally be, and probably was, suggested by and adopted from the phrases "the mystery of lawlessness" and "the lawless one," in verses 7 and 8.

ii. 13.

Again the reader is informed that many ancient "authorities" read "God chose you *as first fruits* (instead of *from the beginning*) unto salvation." Yet it is impossible for the apostle to have said this; for the Thessalonians did not receive the Gospel till after Paul had been engaged in preaching Christ and build-

ing up churches in other fields for about seventeen years. The Thessalonian church was not the first fruits of the Gospel even in Macedonia; for a church was gathered at Philippi before Christ was ever preached in Thessalonica. Yet this false reading is fathered and handed down to us by B, F, the Greek text of G, P, 17, and half a dozen other cursives, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Didymus, Euthalius, Cyril, Ambrosiaster, and others.

I TIMOTHY.

i. 12.

THE witnesses that attest the marginal reading "that enableth (or strengtheneth) me," — a reading taken, probably, from Phil. iv. 13, — instead of "that enabled (or hath strengthened) me," are five cursives and Theophylact. The original scribe of **Σ**, however, reads "that strengtheneth," omitting "me," — the only known "authority" for this reading. Tischendorf, who frequently follows **Σ** where no other modern editor does, pays no attention to this reading. And how Westcott and Hort could place it in their margin as a possibly genuine reading, and induce the Revisers to do the same thing, is a mystery; for the entire context shows that the apostle is thanking the Lord, not as his strengthener at the time, or even as the constant source of strength to him, but as the One who had strengthened him in the past, who had stood by him and bestowed upon him power and influence with men, after having counted him worthy of confidence, and entrusted him with the work of the ministry of reconciliation. (Compare 2 Tim. iv. 17.)

iii. 16.

Rec. T. μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη — great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest.

Rev. T. μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· ὃς ἐφανερώθη — great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested.

In connection with this, the Revisers give the marginal note, "The word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient

ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*"; *i.e.* some ancient documents have δ , *quod*, instead of $\delta\varsigma$, *qui*. The received reading is attested by a twelfth-century corrector of Σ , a modern emendator of A, C third hand, D third hand, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Georgian and Slavonic Versions, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Didymus, Chrysostom, Pseudo-Athanasius, Euthalius, Theodoret, Severus of Antioch, John of Damascus, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others. The revised reading is that of Σ first hand, A first hand apparently, C first hand, the Greek texts of F and G, 17, 73, 181, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, Platt's Ethiopic, Origen according to his Latin interpreter, Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eutharius, Cyril, and others. The Revisers' marginal reading, δ , is the reading of D, the Old Latin versions of *d, f, g*, the Vulgate, Gelasius of Cyzicus (A.D. 476), the Latin Fathers generally, including Hilary, Augustine, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, and others. Besides these, there are several versions whose reading may represent either the masculine $\delta\varsigma$ or the neuter δ , as the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, the Armenian, and the Roman Ethiopic. Of the three readings, it may be unhesitatingly said that δ is not genuine. It is a variation of $\delta\varsigma$, due to the difficulty of making the latter refer back to the neuter noun *μυστήριον*. As such, it supports the reading $\delta\varsigma$. The same grammatical difficulty probably led to the changing of OC, the uncial form of $\delta\varsigma$, into $\overline{\Theta}\overline{C}$, the usual abbreviated form of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as it appears in the earlier uncials. This change would be favored, certainly, by the fact that the statements which follow are evidently predications respecting Christ, who was in the beginning with God, and was God. That $\delta\varsigma$ is the true reading, seems evident from the preponderating external testimony in its favor. In addition to this, it is the hardest reading of the three. If $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ or δ had been the original reading, there is no likelihood that any copyist would have converted either of them into a masculine pronoun to represent a neuter

noun. Again, while it may seem impossible to a superficial reader that the Apostle Paul should have written or dictated $\delta\varsigma$ in this connection, this construction, as we have already seen, is exactly after his manner of writing.¹ The wording, *μυστηρίου . . . ὃς ἐστὶ χριστός*, "of this mystery, which is Christ" in you, etc. (Col. i. 27), is precisely what he gives us here. The only exception that we take to the Revisers' work is that they have given us a most wretched rendering after having corrected the Greek text. Instead of the bungling translation, "Great is the mystery of godliness; He who," etc., the reader ought to have found, "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh," in accordance with the rendering given in Col. i. 27; or, which we should prefer to see, "Great is the mystery of godliness, *even Christ*, who was manifested in the flesh," etc. This not only expresses the apostle's meaning, but does it in clear, intelligible English.

iv. 10.

Rec. T. *κοπιῶμεν καὶ ὀνειδίζομεθα*, — we labor, and suffer reproach.

Rev. T. *κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνίζομεθα*, — we labor and strive.

The common reading here is attested by the seventh-century corrector of Σ , D, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Latin versions of D, F, G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom again and again, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revisers' word "to strive" is supported by the original scribe of Σ , who is noted for his innumerable careless readings, by A, C, K, the Greek texts of F and G, less than ten cursives, and Cyril, but not by a single ancient version. The indications are that, if this reading is not a mere transcriber's blunder in hastily taking the unfamiliar *ΟΝΕΙΔΙΖΟΜΕΘΑ* to be the familiar *ΑΓΩΝΙΖΟΜΕΘΑ*, which is by no means improbable, and which we believe to

¹ See Notes on Eph. i. 14 and Col. i. 27.

have really been the case, it is an early adaptation of the text to Col. i. 29, where the apostle speaks of "laboring and striving" though in a different way. There it was perfectly natural for him to speak of laboring and striving to present every man perfect in Christ, according to the ability which God gave him for doing it. But here it is not up to the apostle's manner and meaning to say that "because of this [*i.e.* the fact that godliness affords promise of life, both now and hereafter], we *labor* and *strive*; for we have set our hope upon the living God," etc. He meant more than that. Come what might, for him, union with Christ was LIFE, whether in this world or in that to come. The consciousness of this enabled him to labor, — to exert himself in toilsome, painful, and continued effort, — and to suffer reproach, — to be willing for Christ's sake to be considered the filth of the world and the offscouring of all things, as he himself, in 1 Cor. iv. 13, explains his meaning of the kindred word *λοιδορεῖσθαι*, "to be reproached and despised." And this he could do, as he goes on to say, because his trust was in God, the preserver of all men, *especially of believers*. If, in place of this thought of readiness to endure reproach, we substitute that of simply striving, we render his language tame even to flatness, and out of harmony with what follows. As conclusive evidence that the received is the true reading, we point to the fact that not a single ancient version contains the other. Even the Latin versions of F and G are a standing protest against the reading of their own Greek texts.

vi. 5.

Rec. T. ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων. — From such withdraw thyself.
Rev. T. Omits.

The genuineness of this clause is attested by D third hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, Mai's Extracts, one copy of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Dam-

ascene, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, Lucifer, and others. The words are wanting in *Σ*, A, D first hand, F, G, 17, 67 second hand, 93, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Gothic, and Roman Ethiopic Versions, and Ambrose. Yet they have every appearance of being genuine. They certainly are not imported from any other of the apostle's writings. Their early omission is easily accounted for by their seeming interference with the connection. But there is no real obstruction of the thought. The apostle, having referred to a class of contentious, evil-minded persons who expected to make religion a source of gain to themselves, very naturally adds the brief injunction, "From such, withdraw"; then, without any real break in the discourse, he goes on, as suggested by the preceding words: "Godliness with contentment, however, is *great* gain." A special emphasis is to be given to the words "is" and "great."

vi. 7.

Rec. T. δῆλον ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα. — and it is certain we can carry nothing out.

Rev. T. ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα. — for neither can we carry anything out.

The first of these readings is supported by *Σ*'s earlier seventh-century corrector, D second hand, K, L, P, every cursive but one, and apparently the Syriac Versions, — "*we know* that" etc., — also by Basil, Macarius, Euthalius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John of Damascus. Codex D first hand, has a similar reading, — ἀληθὲς ὅτι οὐδέ, "and is it *true* that" etc., — which seems to be that followed by the Vulgate and most copies of the Old Latin. The revised reading is attested by *Σ* first hand, A, F, G, 17, one copy of the Old Latin, one or two of the Vulgate, and the Thebaic. (The Vatican manuscript is defective here.) The Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions have "and" in place of ὅτι. Polycarp, in writing to the Philippians, has ἀλλ' οἶδέ instead of ὅτι οὐδέ, — "*but* neither have we anything to carry out." Cyprian three times gives the same reading, employing *verum* in place of ἀλλά, — "*but* neither

can we carry anything out." The Revisers' reading is, very plainly, not the original reading. The apostle did not write in that illogical style. As for the common reading, it lacks proper support. It has every appearance of being a mere makeshift. Dr. Hort thinks that the text adopted by him and the Revisers is the parent of all the other readings. And he is probably right in this. But he does not claim that it presents the original text. On the contrary, he holds, and Dr. Westcott agrees with him in holding, that "a primitive [*i.e.* a very early] corruption must lurk somewhere."¹ But when he attempts to account for the difficulty by supposing that *οτι* arose, in transcribing, out of "an accidental repetition of the last two letters of [the preceding] κόσμον," by reading -ον as οτι, *i.e.* by *not* repeating ον, he is wide of the mark; and Dr. Westcott wisely withholds his assent. The truth evidently is that *οτι* is a very early transcriptional error for *ετι*, made possibly in taking a copy from the autograph itself. Nothing would be easier than to mistake *ΕΤΙ* for *ΟΤΙ*; and the error once made at such a time, the true reading would naturally be lost. It is like printing "selfe" for "selle" from Shakespeare's manuscript of *Macbeth*, referred to in our introduction; or printing "strain at," in Matt. xxiii. 24, for the "strain out" of the manuscript of King James's Revisers; or giving "He" in Matt. xxiii. 39, in the Anglo-American Revisers' "Parallel New Testament," for the "Ye" which their manuscript called for. Restoring *ετι* here for *οτι*, we have the very natural and proper reading, even though it be a *proclivior scriptio*, "For we brought nothing into the world; nor yet can we carry anything out." The apostle employs *ετι* as in Acts ii. 26: "And moreover, my flesh also shall rest in hope." So, too, in 1 Cor. iii. 2, "For ye were not previously able to bear it: yea, ye are not *for that matter* even now able; for ye are still carnal." (Compare also Matt. xxvi. 65, — "besides this"; Matt. xviii. 16, — "more" or "in addition"; and Heb. xi. 32, 36.)

¹ *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 134.

TIMOTHY.

i. ii.

Rec. T. ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. — an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.

Rev. T. ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος. — an apostle, and a teacher.

The Revisers' reading is found in only two Greek manuscripts, — *Σ* first hand, and A; yet this is viewed by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort as authoritative testimony. Codex 17, which usually sides with these documents, omits ἐθνῶν; but, as it reads διάκονος, "a minister," instead of διδάσκαλος, its testimony respecting ἐθνῶν is of but little weight. The received reading, which is accepted as genuine by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, Ellicott, and modern editors generally, is strongly attested by the early seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, every cursive but one, all the Latin Versions, both Syriac Versions, both Egyptian, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, — in fact, all the ancient versions as well as Fathers who quote or refer to the passage. Yet, because the apostle in his first epistle to Timothy speaks of himself as "an apostle and a teacher of the Gentiles," some modern editors think that, in view of the testimony of the two oldest known Greek manuscripts, the testimony of all the other documents should pass for nothing, and the additional word be regarded as having been introduced from the apostle's first epistle. Thus, Tischendorf, in assigning his reason for omitting the word, says, "In view of this testimony, it seems clear that the additional word should not be retained, since it was so easy to transfer it hither from 1 Tim. ii. 7, when Paul's epistles were

first brought out together. It is also to be considered," he adds, "that, as the apostle progressed in his writing, there was no need of adding ἐθνῶν in the same way in both places." This idea of an easy transference of language from one place to another by scribes or critical readers governed Tischendorf's judgment in too many instances, and led to the frequent vitiation of his text. It is far safer to regard the absence of ἐθνῶν from the three manuscripts in which it is wanting as due to misjudgment, ignorance, or carelessness on the part of some early reader or scribe than to consider the word a spurious reading. Its presence is certainly needed to express the apostle's meaning. And the fact that he employed it in one epistle is the very reason why we might expect him to employ it again in precisely similar circumstances in a subsequent epistle. This really seems to be one of those instances in which we need to bear in mind Tischendorf's wiser words as elsewhere expressed: "In spite of the great preference to be given to our oldest Greek manuscripts, we must not overlook the fact that sometimes those opposed to them, and centuries later, have at the same time the authority of much older versions and Fathers."¹ In other words, as Dr. Ezra Abbot says, "though the presumption is in favor of the oldest manuscripts, mere antiquity cannot prove the excellence of a copy," or of a reading.² It is hardly possible that ἐθνῶν, if spurious, should not have been omitted in some one, at least, of the ancient versions or early Fathers.

ii. 18.

The only ancient witnesses in support of the marginal reading, "a resurrection,"—"saying that there has already been a resurrection,"—are $\aleph$, F, G, and 17. The omission of the article is a palpable error, rendering the clause meaningless;

¹ Herzog's *Encyclopedia*, article, "Bibel-Text:—the N. T."

² Schaff-Herzog, *Encycl.* (3d ed.), Vol. i., p. 278.

for, in the first place, the apostle did not preach *a* resurrection, as an indefinite, or local and partial affair. He preached the resurrection of all. Acts xvii. 18; xxiv. 15. Then again, it is incredible that he meant to represent Hymenæus and Philetus as being such simpletons as to claim that an occurrence had taken place, like a general resurrection of the dead, which of necessity would be universally known because of its wide-spread character, and yet was one that nobody had heard of. Much less can it be supposed that, if the apostle wrote "a resurrection," he meant a resurrection of certain individuals,—a circumstance which no one denies, and which there is no harm or heresy in saying. But he doubtless did represent Hymenæus and Philetus as claiming that *the* resurrection had already passed,—meaning thereby, all the resurrection that there was to be,—the alleged and generally supposed future resurrection. Their heresy was the same as that to which the apostle refers in 1 Cor. xv. 12. And to express this thought affirmatively, the article is a necessary part of the text. So that its omission is plainly not to be referred to the apostle. Yet this omission is regarded and accepted by Tischendorf as presenting the genuine reading; it is also preferred by Tregelles and Westcott and Hort as more likely to be the true reading than that of the text because it is the more difficult of the two, while the article is given a place in their margins, as only a possibly genuine reading.

iv. 17.

It must have been through oversight that the plural ἀκούσασιν was not adopted here in place of ἀκούσῃ, "might hear." It is true, the change would not have affected the rendering in the least. But the plural is attested by $\aleph$, A, C, D, E, F, G, P, 17, and about ten other cursives, Eusebius, Euthalius, and others; while the singular is supported by K, L, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, a manuscript of Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and possibly one or two others. It is true that the

singular is in accordance with the apostle's usual mode of writing, and is probably what he wrote. But then, what becomes of the "authorities"? and where is the consistency of changing Rom. ii. 14, and not changing 1 Tim. v. 25, or 2 Tim. iv. 17? — See Note on Rom. ii. 14.

TITUS.

iii. 1.

Rec. T. ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις — to principalities and powers.

Rev. T. ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις — to rulers, to authorities.

The conjunction is preserved in D third hand, E second hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, F, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil twice, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is wanting in **Σ**, A, C, the Greek of D by its first hand, the Greek texts of E and F, both texts of G, 17, 31, and 67. The use of ἀρχή and ἐξουσία together is one of frequent occurrence in the apostle's letters; but nowhere else does he use them connectedly without a conjunction, except in Eph. vi. 12, where in his deliberate and emphatic manner he repeats, instead, the previous preposition before the second of these and two other nouns. It was not his way to employ these words as the Revised Text represents him to have done. The omission of καί was an early error, evidently introduced in consequence of the preceding ἀρχαῖς, leaving the impression upon the careless scribe that he had penned the word when he had not; and though the error is preserved in the oldest extant manuscripts, it was afterwards corrected in some of them, and it vitiates none of the versions except that of G, which is only what might be expected. As long as we have abundant authority for retaining καί, it seems hardly worth while to misrepresent the apostle's manner of speaking because a few evidently vitiated manuscripts do it.

The revised rendering does not do justice to the corresponding Greek. It should rather be, "— be in subjection to rulers, authorities," without the repetition of "to," which implies a corresponding preposition where there is none in the Greek, and greatly relieves the asperity of the new reading.

PHILEMON.

Verse 6.

THIS verse, as rendered by the Revisers, reads, "That the fellowship of thy faith may become effectual, in the knowledge of every good thing which is in you, unto Christ." The ancient documents are nearly equally divided here between "you," of the text, and the marginal reading, "us." The former is supported by $\aleph$, F, G, P, a large number of cursives, perhaps the majority of them, the Clementine Vulgate, two or three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Theophylact, and Primasius. The latter is attested by A, C, D, E, K, L, about fifty cursives, most of the manuscripts of the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Zohrab's Armenian Version, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Œcumenius, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius. Most modern editors adopt or give the preference to the latter; among whom may be mentioned Griesbach, Lachmann, Ellicott, and Alford, as adopting it; while Tregelles and Westcott and Hort insert it in the text, but place "you" in the margin as a secondary reading. Tischendorf, in his last edition, adopts "you" in accordance with the accepted reading and the Revisers' Text. But most editors are against him. The true reading, however, is not to be decided by the testimony of documents. It can be decided only by knowing, if possible, the apostle's meaning. In the midst of a context where a single individual is addressed, and "thou," "thy," "thee," is the word employed, it seems hardly probable at first sight that the apostle would introduce the plural "you" instead. Hence, Meyer and others decide

for "us," denoting Christians generally; and conclude that "you," or rather *ὑμῖν*, is a transcriptional error for *ἡμῖν*, "us," the more easily made because of the scribe's remembering that in verse 2 the apostle had mentioned others besides Philemon, and in verse 3 addressed them as "you," — "Grace to you, and peace," etc. That Meyer's interpretation of the passage is a failure in several respects, there can be no doubt. Hence, his judgment concerning the true reading, as between "you" and "us," is of little worth. Our own belief at first was that "us" is the true reading; but the more we consider the passage, and the better we understand what seems to be the apostle's aim in verses 4-7, the more we are convinced that "you" is, after all, the right word. That aim is evidently to prepare the way for introducing the subject of Onesimus' return, and for pleading with Philemon on his behalf. The meaning of these verses, as it presents itself to us, without going into details, may be briefly given as follows: "I thank my God (always making mention of thee in my prayers when I hear of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and of thy love for all the saints), that the communication [the sharing of what thou hast with others, which is but one of the fruits] of thy faith should become effective for Christ in a hearty recognition [on thy part] of every good thing [whether person, or deed, or word, or undertaking] among you. For I have had much joy and comfort in consequence of [literally, based upon] thy love, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed through thee, brother." This commendation of Philemon for exercising an unselfish benevolence towards the saints and in behalf of every Christian effort among them, with which the apostle closes this introductory paragraph of his letter, seems to call unmistakably for "among *you*" at the close of verse 6. For the apostle would very naturally, in addressing Philemon, speak of his fellow Christians at Colosse, or wherever Philemon lived, under the term "you," from the fact that Philemon was one of them.

Verse 10.

Rec. T. *ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, — in my bonds.

Rev. T. *ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς* — in my bonds.

We see no good reason for omitting the pronoun from the text here. Its presence is attested by the early seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, C, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, — in short, all the ancient versions except the Latin, — Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and other Greek Fathers. It is wanting in *Σ* first hand, A, D first hand, F, G, 17, and three other cursives, the Vulgate, and of course Jerome, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and other Latin Fathers. It is not essential to expressing the thought in the Greek; and for this very reason it may have been dropped by some early scribe. At all events, its retention in the text would not have interfered in the least with the Revisers' legitimate work; and, in fact, the reading of the R. V. implies that it is retained.

Verse 25.

The "many ancient authorities" that read "the Lord," or rather, that omit "our," are *Σ*, P, 17, 31, 47, 116, and the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions. The fact is scarcely worthy of being noted, and probably would not have been, but that Westcott and Hort remove the word from the text, and consign it to the margin. — The note on the omission, by some, of "Amen," at the end of the verse, is also made for a similar reason, and is equally needless. It is true, the word does not even appear in Westcott and Hort, in either margin or text, though it is quite as strongly attested as the other.

HEBREWS.

i. 8.

IN the marginal note, the reader is told that the two oldest manuscripts read "his kingdom," where all other documents have "thy kingdom." But this does not tell half the story. If we were asked why these manuscripts read thus, we should be constrained to say, because some scribe either misunderstood, or sought to pervert, the writer's meaning. Instead of reading ὁ Θεός as a compellative, "O God," he read the verse thus: "But as to the Son he saith, *God is thy throne* for ever and ever; the sceptre of *his kingdom* is a sceptre of righteousness." This reading, which has no support but that of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, Westcott and Hort adopt. It is not the reading of the Septuagint (Psa. xlv. 6), whose readings the writer of this epistle so closely followed throughout, nor is it in harmony with, or up to the level of, his argument, which is to set forth the superiority and supremacy of the Son of God over the highest of created intelligences. The principle with Westcott and Hort, which evidently led to the introduction of this marginal note, is that, aside from the palpably false readings of $\aleph$ and B in Mark iv. 21, Gal. ii. 12, Jas. i. 17, Rev. xviii. 21, and possibly a few "indecisive coincidences" between these manuscripts, no readings of $\aleph$, B, can safely be rejected absolutely, — a principle which no one can adhere to without presenting a more or less vitiated text. It absurdly assumes that the scribes of these texts were all but infallible, and that every other manuscript, every ancient version, every patristic writer that quotes the passage, errs in giving the reading of the text.

i. 12.

Rec. T. ὥσει περιβόλαιον ἔλξεις αὐτούς, — as a vesture shalt thou fold them up.

Rev. T. ὥσει περιβόλαιον ἔλξεις αὐτούς, ὡς ἱμάτιον, — as a mantle shalt thou roll them up, as a garment.

The received reading (without addition) is according to D second hand, K, L, M, P, all the cursives, the Latin version of F, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and others. The revised is the reading of $\aleph$, A, B, D first hand, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions. Lachmann adopts the latter reading; Tregelles gives it the preference, still admitting that the other may be the true reading; while Westcott and Hort, in adopting it, connect ὡς ἱμάτιον with what follows, and read, "As a mantle shalt thou roll them together; as a garment they shall also be changed." That it is a false reading is obvious. The phrase "as a garment" comes in very appropriately in verse 11: "They all shall wax old *as doth a garment*." But here, in verse 12, it is out of place, so that editors hardly know what to do with it. The Revisers connect it with the preceding clause. But it is a bungling, superfluous addition there. Westcott and Hort connect it with the following verb, but not as the scribe of E did, by placing it after καί, for he saw that otherwise the conjunction would be misplaced and the words rendered meaningless; for nothing is previously spoken of as being "changed." If the verb were "shall wax old," — the word that is used in verse 11, — there might be some propriety in having καί follow ὡς ἱμάτιον, and reading, "As a garment they shall *also grow old*." But what settles the whole question is the fact that the writer is quoting from Psa. cii. 25–27, closely following the Septuagint Version here as elsewhere; and in that connection the phrase appears only as it is given here in verse 11. The expression was, no doubt, transferred by some early reader from the preceding

verse to the margin as a possible explanation of the meaning of the phrase *ὥσει περιβόλαιον*; and some one, afterwards copying from this, and supposing the words to be a part of the text, inserted them as best he could. And so it comes down to us in a few old manuscripts, while the genuine text is preserved in earlier versions and later manuscripts. Notwithstanding the testimony of the oldest known manuscripts, Tischendorf, with all his partiality for **S**, adheres to the received reading, as do Meyer and others.

iii. 16.

The Revisers, as well as a number of modern editors and commentators, take the first word of this verse as the interrogative *τίνες*, "who?" instead of the indefinite pronoun *τινές*, "some;" and consequently place an interrogation point, instead of a colon or a semicolon, after the word "provoke." This either makes the *γάρ* that introduces the verse meaningless and useless, or compels us to take it as a mere emphatic expletive, equivalent to "why," "forsooth," or some such word, — "Why, who did provoke?" But, by so doing, we obtain a harsh, unnatural construction, altogether unlike anything else in the epistle. Besides, there is no need of it. On the contrary, the common reading, properly understood, seems to present the writer's thoughts connectedly and clearly, giving the following forcible, conclusive, and apparently satisfactory argument: We are made partakers of Christ, if we really hold the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end, while it is said, To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts as was done in the provocation. That is, we have become partakers through Christ of an inheritance in heaven if we firmly maintain from first to last our confidence and trust in him as long as we are privileged to hear God's warning voice, and do not harden our hearts and provoke him by distrusting him, as the Israelites did in the wilderness. For some of them, when they heard, did provoke him. Yea, did not all who came out of Egypt by Moses

do this? Yes, nearly all. And with whom was he displeased during those forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned?—and so on to verse 19, where we find that those who failed to enter into rest, failed "because of unbelief" as we read in Num. xiv. They were not, so to speak, "made partakers of Christ," because they did not "hold the beginning of their confidence firm unto the end," as they might have done. The argument in its course passes from the affirmative declaration of verse 14 to the negative statement with which it concludes in verse 19. And this it does without harshness, without a break, and as far as we can see, without any real ground of perplexity.

iv. 2.

Rec. T. *μὴ συγκεκραμένους* — not being mixed.

Rev. T. *μὴ συγκεκρασμένους* — because they were not united.

The first of these readings is attested by **S**, 13, 31, 37, 41, 114, the Latin versions of D and E, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and Lucifer. The other, in one of its varying forms with uniform ending, is supported by A, B, C, D, E, K, L, M, P, most of the cursives, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euthalius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Photius, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others. The entire clause, according to the Canterbury Revisers' rendering, reads thus: "But the word of hearing did not profit them, because they were not united by faith with them that heard." This, the younger Buttmann calls a "hermeneutically difficult" reading. It is rejected by Tischendorf, the American Revisers, and some of the ablest of modern commentators, as an impossible reading. One of the English Revisers, in attempting to explain it, says, "Its meaning appears to be, The word of the message did not profit those to whom it was preached, because they were not united by faith (not made one in heart) with those who heard the message (viz. Moses and the Prophets [or, as others have

it, Joshua and Caleb]], and preached it." Another of them says, in reference to the passage, "Overwhelming critical evidence compels us to accept the somewhat strange rendering of the R. V. Many critics of high name have been tempted to abide by the apparently far simpler and more satisfactory reading which is represented in the A. V.; but faithfulness to the laws of evidence and grammar will not permit of such a course."¹ But he does not venture on an explanation of the meaning of this overwhelmingly attested reading. There certainly is nothing in the laws of grammar that will not permit our accepting the reading of the Received Text; neither is there in the laws of evidence, or in our faithfulness to those laws. In the first place, our intuitive discernment, or what some might call common sense, assures us that the reading represented by the A. V. is not only a "more satisfactory reading," but, apart from all documentary evidence, one that commends itself as more probably the true reading than the other. In the next place, it is not a reading without any external evidence to support it. It is not a conjectural reading. So far, then, we are not unfaithful to the laws of evidence. "No; but the evidence is insufficient." Are we sure of that? What if the last syllable, -ους, of the Revisers' word should be a transcriptional blunder for -ος? What would the "overwhelming critical evidence" be worth? Simply nothing. Yet this is just what that reading is,—an error to which the preceding *ἐκείνους* probably gave rise; one of a class of errors abounding in all the manuscripts more or less. If faithfulness to the laws of evidence requires us to adopt such readings when they occur mainly or wholly in the older manuscripts, why not be consistent and faithful in following all false readings found in those manuscripts? We are not to stultify ourselves when judging of the value of documentary evidence, any more than when we are in the jury-box, weighing the evidence presented to us in a court

¹ Roberts: *Companion of the R. V.*, p. 35.

of justice. The reading of the Received Text here, testified to by *Σ*, and by the Peshito Syriac, the most ancient of all our witnesses, is, no doubt, the genuine reading. The words *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, however, should be rendered, "upon their hearing it," or, "when they heard it"; for, according to classic rather than general New-Testament usage, these words are *temporally* subordinate to the clause, *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει*, "not having been mixed with (or, accompanied by) faith."¹ Taking the words thus, they afford a plain and conclusive reason why the word preached proved unprofitable: "The word addressed to the ear did not profit them [*i.e.* those just referred to], as it was not mixed with faith when they heard it." Dr. Hort's objection to this reading, that it identifies "them" with *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, which thus, he says, "becomes a superfluous and at the same time ambiguous repetition," is by no means transparent. Where the ambiguity lies, it is hard to see. And how it can be called a superfluous repetition, if properly understood, it is equally difficult to discover. As already indicated, the American Revisers did not unite with their British co-laborers in this change. They stand by the Received Text.

vi. 2.

A marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities read *the teaching of*" in place of "of the teaching of." That is, B and *d*, the Latin Version of D, make "teaching," like "foundation," the object of the participle translated "laying." The Latin Version *e*, accompanying Codex E, instead of *doctrinam*, the reading of *d*, has the ablative, *doctrina*, meaning "*with* the teaching of baptisms." All other manuscripts and versions have the reading of the text,—"of the teaching (or doctrine) of baptisms." It seems hardly proper to suppose that the true reading of any ordinary passage could have been preserved in

¹ Compare Heb. vi. 6, vii. 1, etc., and Buttmann, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, § 144, 1, 2.

a single Greek manuscript and a single copy of an old version; and yet in this instance it may be. Some genuine readings, no doubt, have disappeared altogether from manuscripts, versions, and patristic writings, as far as known and examined. The passage before us is a peculiar one. The Greek manuscript in which the marginal reading appears is the oldest New-Testament manuscript known. This manuscript is supported in this reading by a copy of one of the very oldest versions, which, in this rendering, forsakes not only every other copy of that version, but the Greek manuscript itself, of which it professes to be a translation. These facts mean something. The reading cannot be accounted for on the score of its being a blunder. In a long sentence like this, bristling with genitives, there is not the least probability that a transcriber should make such a blunder as to write an accusative for a genitive; though the contrary might easily have been done. Nor is there a shadow of a possibility that an interpreter should translate a genitive by an unmeaning accusative. Neither can the two—the Greek accusative and the Latin accusative—fairly be regarded as coming from the same source, if that source is a false reading, especially as the Greek text (D) of which this Latin reading (*d*) professes to be a version gives no countenance to this latter reading. It may be said that the accusative in B is the result of an early tampering with the text,—a result preserved elsewhere only in *d*. This is the only rational way of accounting for it, if it is a false reading. And yet, such is its nature that, but for the overwhelming documentary evidence against it, it would be hardly possible to question its genuineness. Let us look at it as related to the context. In construction, as already observed, this accusative is to be taken as a second object of the participle *καταβαλλόμενοι*,—unless, as the marginal note intimates, it should be regarded as in apposition with “foundation,”—“not laying again the *foundation* of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, *even the teaching* of baptisms,” etc. But this construction is neither allowable nor

plausible. If this were the best that could be done, we might be led to reject the accusative as an unaccountably strange and false reading. But we go back to *καταβαλλόμενοι*. We question it as to its meaning and use. It appears elsewhere in the New Testament only twice; namely, in 2 Cor. iv. 9, and Rev. xii. 10. In both these passages it is rendered “cast down.”¹ This is really its true meaning here, of which it has been deprived in consequence of the presence of *πάλιν*, “again.” The latter word, however, is not to be taken in the sense of “once more,” or “a second time,” as it evidently is by both King James’s and the Canterbury Revisers. It has reference to a former condition of things, and denotes, with its verb, a return, a coming back to that previous state, though that coming back may not be a *second* return, but the first. Its use here, as in verse 6, is no doubt somewhat pleonastic. Properly translated, the writer’s words mean, “Not casting down again the foundation principles of repentance from dead works and of faith in God [*i.e.* not subverting and renouncing them, and *being again* without any ground to build on], or the teaching of baptisms, and of the laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.” This makes “teaching” the object of “casting down,” used figuratively for “rejecting,” and gives what seems to be the very thought of the writer, who, as the whole context shows, is warning his readers against backsliding and its consequences. The only apparent objection to this reading and rendering seems to be the want of the conjunction *ἢ*, “or,” in connection with this accusative,—which, however, may very easily have been lost from the text through a misunderstanding of the writer’s meaning. Another thing that gives strong color to this as the true reading is the fact that *θεμέλιον* is thereby made to refer only to repentance and

¹ In Rev. xii. 10, the Revisers have followed the majority of other modern editors, and adopted the simple instead of the compound verb in their Greek text, though in their Version they retain “cast down,” the rendering of the rejected compound verb.

faith as the fundamentals of the Christian life, while the other four things are made subjects of needful instruction,—the first two of them being matters of practice to a greater or less extent in the apostolic church; and the other two being truths of cardinal importance to men as believers in Christ. On both of these classes of subjects there was more or less questioning and doubt in that early day; and believers needed to be taught the truth respecting them.

If βαπτισμῶν διδαχὴν is, as it appears to be, the true reading, it settles at once the question whether the writer means “the doctrine (or teaching) of baptisms,” or whether, as some infer from the order of the words, the only meaning that his language will allow is “baptisms of doctrine,” *i.e.* baptisms consequent upon teaching, baptisms administered after due instruction,—though it must be confessed it is difficult to get the latter meaning out of the two genitives. With an accusative, however, for the second word of the combination, the difficulty disappears; the only possible rendering to be given to the words is, “teaching of baptisms,” instruction respecting baptisms. It decides, also, the government and construction of the three leading genitives that follow, all being dependent upon this accusative, as already shown. In a word, it clears up the whole passage,—which is one of the best evidences of its being a genuine reading. The accusative early became changed to a genitive through the influence of the successive pairs of genitives with which it stands connected.—Lachmann, as well as Westcott and Hort, admits διδαχὴν into the text on the sole documentary evidence of B and *Δ*. It is strongly supported, however, by internal evidence.

viii. 8.

The American Revisers here very properly call attention to what seems to be a false reading in the Received Text, which the Canterbury Revisers retain, namely, “finding fault *with them*.” Instead of this, the American Committee suggest as a

marginal reading, “finding fault *with it*”; *i.e.* with the first covenant, which is spoken of in the preceding verse as not faultless. This reading is supported by the early seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, B, D third hand, E, L, nearly all the cursives, John of Damascus, and other Greek Fathers. The reading of the text, which represents God as censuring his people, rather than expressing dissatisfaction with the Old Covenant, is supported by *Σ* first hand, A, D first hand, K, P, four cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Peshito Syriac Versions, Euthalius, Theodoret, and Chrysostom in one place, though elsewhere he favors the other reading. The correspondence between “faultless” in verse 7 and “finding fault” in verse 8, as well as the entire subsequent context, seems to leave no doubt that the true reading is the marginal reading suggested by the American Revisers.

x. 1.

Rec. T. ὁ νόμος . . . οὐδέποτε δύναται — the law . . . can never.

Rev. T. ὁ νόμος . . . οὐδέποτε δύνανται — the law . . . they can never.

The English Revisers have banished the verb of the Received Text to the margin, with the note that some ancient authorities read “it can”; *i.e.* “the law can never.” The witnesses for this reading are D first and third hands (the latter correcting the change made by the second hand), E, H, K, L, the majority of the cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic and Bashmuric Versions, Origen, Chrysostom giving the text, Theodoret, and Œcumenius, who adds, “That is, *the law* can never.” The plural, which the Revisers have adopted, is found in *Σ*, A,¹ C, D second hand, P, 17, and between thirty and forty other cursives, Chrysostom in two other instances, Euthalius, John Damascene, and Theophylact. Dr.

¹ Codex B is defective in the rest of this epistle, as well as in the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, and in the Apocalypse. The B of the Apocalypse is a manuscript by a later hand.

Hort very strangely says,¹ "The analogies of ix. 9, x. 11 (the sacrifices) and x. 10 (the Levitical priest, answering to the true High Priest) are in favor of δύνανται." But, finding it "difficult to think that we have the text quite complete," he proceeds to give several changes, in order, if possible, to make δύνανται a suitable reading. In all this, Dr. Westcott is unable to agree with him. And justly; for these passages represent the *sacrifices*, not the priests, as unable to make the worshippers perfect, just as the singular, δύναιται, does here: "The law . . . can never, with the same *sacrifices* year after year, . . . make perfect," etc. But, with the plural, it is not the sacrifices but the Levitical priests that are represented as unable to accomplish the work: "The law having a shadow of the good things to come, . . . they [*i.e.* the priests] can never with the same sacrifices . . . make perfect them that draw nigh." This reading not only shows Dr. Hort's remarks to be somewhat inconsiderate, but makes the writer speak entirely out of harmony with his teachings elsewhere. Nor is this all. It renders purposeless and unmeaning the clause preceding. Why this reference to the law as a shadow of good things to come, if it is not the observance and work of the law that is about to be spoken of? According to this reading, however, the Levitical priests ought to have been referred to as shadows, rather than the law and its rites.—Still other considerations might be urged to show that the Received Text presents the original reading. But these are not necessary. There can hardly be a question in the mind of any impartial judge respecting the plural δύνανται. It is too plainly erroneous,—occasioned by the foregoing προσφέρουσιν, "they offer." The fact that it is attested by the three oldest known manuscripts ought not, in view of all the circumstances, to have a feather's weight. And so Tischendorf, the American Revisers, and others who adopt the singular are forced to conclude.

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 131.

X. 34.

Rec. T. γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς — knowing in yourselves that ye have.

Rev. T. γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῦς — knowing that ye yourselves have.

The marginal reading, "that ye have for yourselves," is to be preferred here to that of the text, either the Received or the Revised. The received reading, indeed, is unsupported except by a few cursives. It is an obvious interpretation of ἑαυτοῖς, the marginal reading, and is of comparatively recent date. The Revisers' ἑαυτοῦς is attested by **Σ**, A, H, five cursives, the Memphitic Version, Clement of Alexandria, and Euthalius. The Latin versions of D, E, F, and the Vulgate read *vos*, though this does not properly represent the reflexive of the Greek. In like manner, the Paschal Chronicle substitutes ὑμᾶς for ἑαυτοῦς. These readings clearly indicate that, on the part of those who made them, there was a sense of the unfitness of *vosmet*, *vos ipsos*, or ἑαυτοῦς in this connection. And so there is. There is nothing in the context to call for the emphatic reading, "Knowing that ye *yourselves* have a better possession." But, as the writer had just addressed his readers as having joyfully submitted to being robbed of their goods, he very naturally added that they did this under the consciousness that they had *for themselves*, or still remaining to *themselves*, a better possession, and one that would abide by them. It was simply because the force of the dative here was not perceived that it was early changed to the accusative. And this reading, by having been transmitted to us in the two oldest extant Greek manuscripts, is thrust into the text as the true one. The simple dative ἑαυτοῖς is attested as genuine by D, E, K, L, about seventy cursives, Chrysostom, Isidore, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Theophylact. It is adopted by Griesbach, Matthæi, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. Instead of standing in the margin, it ought to have its rightful place in the text, as it has in editions embodying the readings and renderings preferred by the American Committee of Revisers.

xii. 3.

Rec. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν, — contradiction of sinners against himself.

Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀντιλογίαν, — gainsaying of sinners against themselves.

We have here another change in the text for which the English Revisers alone are responsible.—The first of these varying readings, under the different forms of *αὐτόν*, *αὐτόν*, and *ἑαυτόν* (for the manuscripts present the reflexive under all these forms), is attested by A, D third hand, E second hand, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Latin version of F, the Clementine Vulgate, several copies of Jerome's, the Memphitic Version, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and others. The Revisers' reading, under the forms of *ἑαυτοὺς* and *αὐτοὺς*, is supported by *Σ*, D first hand, E first hand, 17, four copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Euthalius, and Theodoret. The Syriac Version translates very freely, "Consider how much he suffered from sinners, those who were enemies of their own life;" *i.e.* their own enemies. While the received reading is perfectly appropriate, and harmonizes with the preceding line of thought, this revised reading introduces an idea altogether out of harmony with the context. It carries upon its face the stamp not merely of improbability but of counterfeit currency. On this ground, and only on this, it is rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, the American Committee of Revisers, and others. But Westcott and Hort cling to it because of its apparent antiquity; and through them it appears in the Revised Text. Another of the English Revisers tries to explain the expression "against themselves" by saying, "'Sinners against their own souls,' as we read in Num. xvi. 38." But this is not a parallel passage; for here the meaning is that the censurers of "the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense" were "hallowed," consecrated to the Lord, and became *a witness against them*, a standing memorial in the presence

of the Israelites of the sin by which they perished. The reading adopted by the Revisers did not originate in carelessness, as some may suppose, but in a misinterpretation, through ignorance, of the writer's meaning. This is evident from the rendering *in vobis*, which appears in the Latin versions accompanying D and E. This tells the whole story. It shows that the reading *ἑαυτοὺς* arose from connecting that word with "ye," the subject of the verb "consider," and of "become weary," following immediately after. And the meaning thus intended to be given to the verse was, "Consider *among yourselves* him that endured such contradiction of sinners, lest ye become wearied *in your souls* unto fainting." But it was not generally so understood. And very properly, because such a distortion of the apostle's language as this construction calls for is by no means admissible. The order of his words forbids it.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε, — If ye endure chastening.

Rev. T. εἰς παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε. — It is for chastening that ye endure.

The common reading, *εἰ*, is attested only by a large number of cursives, Euthalius, and Theophylact. The other (*εἰς*) is attested by all the uncials, more than fifty cursives, the Vulgate, and virtually the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions. Codex D, however, connects *εἰς παιδεῖαν* with the preceding words: "But he scourgeth every son whom he *receiveth for chastening*"; then puts the following *ὑπομένετε* in the aorist imperative, *ὑπομείνατε*, "endure." Some of the Latin versions translate the words *in disciplina*; some, *in disciplinam*; and one at least, *in doctrinam*. The reading evidently troubled the ancients, as it does our modern critics and interpreters. Let us, then, look at the other reading for a moment or two. It is true, the documentary evidence in favor of this is comparatively weak. But it is not quite so feeble relatively as that calling for "strain out a gnat," in our English

Version, in which the documentary evidence — authorized, too, at that — in support of “strain *at* a gnat,” is of the most voluminously overwhelming character. But let us suppose that *ei* may be the true reading. How does it fit in? It makes verse 7 begin (A.V.), “If ye endure chastening”; while verse 8 begins, “But if ye be without chastening,” etc. That is to say, If, on one supposition, ye are chastened, ye may infer thus and so; but if, on the other hand, ye are not chastened, ye may come to another and very different conclusion. So far, then, as to whether *ei* or *eis* be the true reading, the writer’s argument leaves us very little room to doubt. The word “endure,” however, is not the best word by which to bring out his meaning in *ὑπομένετε*. This word literally means to remain under, then to continue patiently or without chafing under, to remain under and be submissive to. Now, by giving this rendering to *ὑπομένετε*, and reading *ei* in connection with it, we have what we may consider, without doubt, the writer’s thought as well as his words. To show this the more clearly, we give the two verses together: “If ye continue submissive under chastening, God is dealing with you as with sons. For what son is there whose father does not chasten him? But if ye are [*i.e.* if ye continue, or are left] without chastening, ye are not dealt with as sons, — ye are not sons, ye are not genuine children.” The internal evidence thus makes it conclusively clear that “if” is the true reading. The other is an early transcriber’s error.

xii. 18.

Rec. T. *ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει, καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ*, — unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

Rev. T. *ψηλαφωμένῳ καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ*, — unto *a mount* that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

The presence of *ὄρει*, as a part of the text, is attested by D, K, L, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Armenian Version, Chrysostom twice, Athanasius, Theodoret,

John Damascene, Œcumenius, and others. But the word is wanting in *Σ*, A, C, 17, 47, the Latin versions accompanying D and F, several manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Erpenius’ Arabic, Origen in one place, but not in two others afterwards, Euthalius, Primasius, and others. If the Revisers’ Greek presents the genuine reading here, then the translation which they have given to it in the text is an improper one. The Greek words do not call for the inserting of “a mount” in the rendering. The insertion of this expression obviously indicates a want of confidence on the part of a majority of the body of Revisers in their own text, the only legitimate meaning of which is, “unto a palpable and kindled fire,” as the Revisers give it in the margin. But this reveals a suspicious reading; for the kindling or burning of a fire naturally *precedes* the feeling of it, not only in fact, but in the expression of the fact. It is true that a previous mention of *ὄρος*, or of some locality, is implied, in verse 19, in the words, “which voice *they that heard* intreated,” etc. This language, as well as what follows, shows that the preceding statements are not of a general, indefinite nature without any local reference, as the language of the revised Greek text up to that point indicates. Hence it is impossible to resist the conclusion that *ὄρει* is a part of the genuine text. And this consideration may have led to the insertion of “a mount” into the R. V. But the idea does not inhere in, nor is it implied by, the revised Greek text. The conviction that *ὄρει* is necessary in order to express the writer’s thought simply indicates that the word has been omitted in those documents in which it is wanting. It ought to be restored to the text in accordance with the demands of external and internal evidence, its presence being essential to express the obvious meaning of the writer, — a tangible mountain, as opposed to the intangible, spiritual Mount Zion of verse 22.

xiii. 21.

Rec. T. ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ — in every good work.

Rev. T. ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ — in every good thing

The received reading here is well attested by C, D third hand, K, M, P, the whole body of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret twice, John Damascene, and others. Codex A reads, "in every good work and word,"—the addition of "and word" having been made, apparently, from 2 Thess. ii. 17. The omission of ἔργῳ is according to **Σ**, D first hand, the Latin versions of D and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Euthalius, Primasius, and others. Tischendorf (in accordance with his principle of rejecting the one of two rival readings that corresponds more or less with a genuine reading elsewhere) omits "work," under the idea that it must have been introduced from 2 Thess. ii. 17, because it is wanting in **Σ**. Westcott and Hort also omit the word. But Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, and others generally retain it as genuine, as in fact the documentary evidence demands, and as the connection,— "making you perfect in *doing* his will in every good work" or endeavor,— seems to require.

Rec. T. ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν — working in you.

Rev. T. ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν — working in us.

This clause, following on immediately after the above, speaks for itself. The documentary testimony in regard to the reading is as follows: In favor of the received reading, A, C, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions accompanying D and F, the Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret in citing the passage, John Damascene, and Theophylact. In favor of the revised, are **Σ**, the Greek text of D, K, M, about twenty-five cursives, the Armenian Version, Œcumenius in both text and comment, and Theodoret in commenting on the passage. But this reading,

even if the documentary evidence preponderated in its favor instead of inclining strongly the other way, ought to be set aside as an obvious itacism originating in carelessness. The very connection shows that "you," not "us," is the proper and undoubtedly genuine reading: "Make *you* perfect in every good work to do his will, working in *you* that which is well-pleasing in his sight." The original scribe of D presents us with the reading "make us perfect" instead of "make you perfect," as well as with the reading "working in us"; and it is possible that both these erroneous readings originated in the exemplar from which Codex D was taken. The former, however, is now found only in the Greek text of D, while the latter has been preserved not only in D, but in **Σ** and a few other kindred documents.

JAMES.

i. 12.

Rec. T. *ὃν ἐπηγγεῖλατο ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.* — which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.

Rev. T. *ὃν ἐπηγγεῖλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.* — which *the Lord* promised to them that love him.

The omission of *ὁ Κύριος* appears only in *Σ*, A, B, one cursive, one manuscript of the Old Latin, and in most editions of the Armenian Version. The reading of the Received Text is supported by C, K, L, P, almost every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the Venetian edition of the Armenian, and John Damascene twice, though some of these versions, and four or five cursives, read "God" instead of "the Lord." There are those who speak of God as "He" and "Him," using the word independently, without reference to an antecedent, and generally spelling it with a capital initial. But that was not the Apostle James's way of speaking. The Revisers' Greek, in fact, leaves the verb without any subject, not even a pronoun expressed. In the preceding context after verse 7, the apostle makes no reference to the Lord. In that verse, he assures his readers that a man of wavering, doubtful mind need not think that he shall receive anything of the Lord. Then follow various observations respecting persons of one kind and another, — the double-minded, the lowly, the rich, the patient man. In speaking of the last, the apostle pronounces him blessed in enduring temptation. Now it is incredible that, after speaking thus of men, he should proceed and say, "For, being approved, he shall receive the crown of life which he promised to them that

love him," — the second "he" of this sentence being only implied, and yet meaning the Lord. It is far more credible that some careless copyist overlooked the *ΟΚC*, standing in his exemplar for *ὁ Κύριος*, and passed on without it. If such omissions were not common among transcribers, the case would be very different. But knowing that they are of frequent occurrence, and, after being once made, are too often mechanically repeated, we have every reason for concluding that this is what must have occurred here. Let us not, then, do the apostle the injustice of attributing to him an error that he could hardly have committed, and that can so easily be accounted for in the few documents in which it appears, especially as we find it necessary, in translating his mutilated words, to supply what he himself, beyond all reasonable doubt, wrote. The error of omitting "the Lord" here is certainly not as great as that of writing *ἀποσκίασματος* for *ἀποσκίασμα*, "shadow," in verse 17, a reading which is utterly unmeaning, and yet appears in *Σ* and B, — and only in those two manuscripts.

ii. 20.

Rec. T. *ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν.* — faith without works is dead.

Rev. T. *ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή ἐστίν.* — faith apart from works is barren.

The common reading here is supported by *Σ*, A, C second hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Usan's Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Æcumenius, and others. The revised reading, *ἀργή*, is that of B, C first hand, 27, 29, one manuscript of the Old Latin Version, three of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, and Zohrab's Armenian. It is obviously an early scholiast's work, intended to show the apostle's meaning in the word "dead." First written in the margin, it afterwards crept into the text,

and so appears in a few documents. It is an unmeaning platitude in comparison with the apostle's word, which appears also in verse 17, where ἀργή would be, if possible, still more inapt, and in verse 26, which forbids its use. The idea that faith without its fruits or resultant works is barren, is one which the apostle would hardly think of presenting. But that faith, if it produce no results, is *dead*,—virtually no faith at all, is a truth which many need to have taught them before they can realize it. Νεκρά is too strongly attested, and too expressive of the apostle's thought, to be set aside.

ii. 26.

Rec. T. χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων — without works.

Rev. T. χωρὶς ἔργων — without works.

The presence of the article is attested by A, C, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, a catena, Theophylact and Œcumenius. It is wanting in **Σ**, B, 69, 182, and Origen, who may have cited the words from memory, or without any regard to the article. The article is used by the apostle in verses 18 and 20, the only other places where he speaks of "faith without works." And in all these passages,—as much here as in the others,—it seems to be necessary in order to the real expression of his meaning. These are among the places where the true force of the article is, perhaps, best expressed in English by the personal pronoun. Thus, in verse 18, we should render the words, "Show me thy faith without *its* works, and I will show thee my faith by *its* works." So, too, in verse 20, as well as here, "Faith without *its* works is dead." In each of these instances, τῶν ἔργων means the works of faith, its necessary results. Without the article, the meaning, though nearly the same, is less expressive: "Faith without results is dead." But as faith is particularized,—*"the faith," i.e. the faith of the Christian as such, the faith that lays hold on Christ, so the works need to be particularized to denote the works which such a faith produces, and not works in general.*

iii. 3.

Rec. T. ἰδοὺ — Behold.

Rev. T. εἰ δέ — Now if.

The revised reading is attested by **Σ**, A, B, K, L, twenty-five cursives, *ff* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, John Damascene, and Œcumenius. That of the Received Text is supported by C, P, a large number of cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, and Theophylact. Other readings are "Moreover," and "Why then?" but they are evident departures from the original. Of the two given above, εἰ δέ may be the more difficult; but it does not follow from this that, with all its attestation, it is the true reading. As we have already observed, the old manuscripts do not always distinguish between εἰ and ι, as later manuscripts do. Hence we find such spellings as ἡμεῖν for ἡμῖν, and ὑμεῖν for ὑμῖν. In Acts xxvi. 5, for example, **Σ**, C, E, have θρησκία, while A, B, H, L, P, and others have θρησκεία; in Col. ii. 18, C, D, E, F, G, P, and others adopt the former spelling, while **Σ**, A, B, L, and others adopt the latter; and in Jas. i. 26, 27, the first of these modes of writing the word is followed by **Σ**, while the second is generally adopted by other manuscripts. Again, in Acts i. 15, Codex E has εἴκοσι for εἴκοσι, "twenty"; and in the next verse, **Σ**, B, D, have Δαυείδ for the more common Δαβίδ, "David." There is, in fact, much irregularity among the manuscripts on this as on many other orthographical points. So that here εἰδέ may be only another way of spelling ἰδε, which may be said to be but another form of ἰδοῦ. (Compare Mark xiii. 21; John xix. 4; Gal. v. 2, etc.) In fact, the context seems to require us so to regard it. In the next verse, we read ἰδοὺ καὶ τὰ πλοῖα (where Codex 24 reads εἰδέ κ.τ.λ.), "Behold also the ships." And in the verse following, we read, "Behold how great," etc. Just so, in chapter v., the apostle uses "Behold" for calling attention in verses 4, 7, 9, 11, successively,—showing that this was a peculiarity

of his. But what seems to indicate that ἰδοὺ (or ἰδε) is the true reading here is the καί in verse 4, "Behold *also* the ships," — the "also," which connects the two similitudes, implying that attention had previously been called to something else, and now is called to ships that are guided by a small rudder. Hence, in view of the questionable testimony of the three oldest manuscripts and their associates, and the strong internal evidence against it, we believe the Received Text gives us the apostle's real meaning and form of expression.

iii. 5.

Rec. T. ὀλίγον πῦρ — a little fire.

Rev. T. ἡλίκον πῦρ — how small a fire!

The received reading is attested by A first hand, C second hand, K, L, all the cursives, a catena, *ff* of the Old Latin Version, Mai's Extracts, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, John Damascene, and Theophylact. The revised is supported by **X**, A second hand, B, C first hand, P, the Vulgate, Antiochus, and Œcumenius, — respectively seventh and tenth century writers. A reading like this, so hard and yet so easily accounted for, one might suppose would make believers in hard readings as such pause some time before adopting it. In the close connection in which it stands to ἡλίκην, a scribe, writing from dictation, might very naturally have become confused in regard to the word, and, taking ὀλίγον to be ἡλίκον, have written the latter instead of the former. One might infer this from the documentary evidence, which preponderates so strongly in favor of ὀλίγον, — including every cursive, and every ancient version but one, as well as one of the four oldest Greek manuscripts. But the reading speaks for itself: ἡλίκος properly means "how great," "how much," "how large," — like *quantus* in Latin. In the language of irony, it may be employed, as many another word may be, to denote its opposite, and so mean "how small,"

"how little," as the satirist Lucian uses it in a single instance. But the Apostle James is not dealing in irony. Besides, it would hardly be possible for him to use ἡλίκον and ἡλίκην in opposite senses with only one word between the two, even if he were speaking ironically; much less could he do it while uttering plain, sober truth. If ἡλίκον is the apostle's word, those who believe in "translating as far as possible the same Greek word by the same English word," should adhere to principle, and "faithfully" translate, "How much wood (or rather, How great a forest) is kindled by *how much* fire!" It is just as possible to render the words thus in English as it was for the Apostle James to have written the corresponding words in Greek. But he never wrote thus, — the two oldest Greek manuscripts to the contrary notwithstanding.

v. 20.

The reading, γινώσκετε, "know ye," alluded to in the margin as read by some in place of γινωσκέτω, "let him know," is supported only by B, 31, 184, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions. The verb seems to have been changed to the second person plural in order to refer back to the introductory word of the previous verse, ἀδελφοί, "brethren," because of an apparent doubt about its reference as a verb in the third person singular, — whether to the one converted or to the one converting him. It has every appearance of being an altered reading. If it had been genuine, there is no probability that the third person would ever have been introduced or would have supplanted it. Though adopted by Westcott and Hort, it is really entitled to no notice.

I PETER.

iii. 21.

Rec. T. ψ . . . ἀντίτυπον — the like figure whereunto.

Rev. T. δ . . . ἀντίτυπον — which . . . after a true likeness.

The only documentary evidence in support of the first of these readings is a large number of cursives, among which is 104, a carefully written manuscript of the eleventh century, containing the whole New Testament. The δ of the Revised Text is attested by the seventh-century corrector of $\aleph$, A, B, C, K, L, P, between fifty and sixty cursives, a catena, the Vulgate and Armenian Versions, Didymus, Cyril, John Damascene, Theophylact, Eecumenius, Cyprian, and others. The original scribe of $\aleph$, Codex 73, and the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions omit the relative. Constrained by documentary testimony, modern editors generally read δ instead of ψ . Yet internal evidence compels us to believe, with Dr. Hort, that the former is "a primitive error for ψ , the force of which might be hidden by the interposition of καὶ ὑμᾶς before ἀντίτυπον. . . . Both by sight and by sound the interchange of letters would be easy."¹ We cannot, however, regard the change as accidental. It seems, rather, to have originated as a correction, under a misapprehension of the reference intended by the relative. "O is evidently designed to refer to the preceding word, ὕδατος, "water"; whereas the original ψ , as we understand it, relates to the preceding statement concerning the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark by means of water. After making

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 102.

that statement, the apostle goes on to say, "Whose counterpart (literally, The antitype to which), baptism, doth now save you also, — not the putting away of filth from the flesh, but the request of a good conscience on God's behalf, — through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Εἰς Θεόν is not to be taken in the sense of "toward God," as is commonly done. It denotes the motive under which the ἐπερώτημα, the request to be baptized, is supposed to be made, — literally, "for God," *i.e.* on God's behalf, or on God's account, the sense in which the preposition is used in Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ii. 12; etc. It is done to obey and honor God. The last six words of the verse, of course, are to be taken with the first clause, as showing how baptism saves, — through faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is symbolized and confessed in the act of baptism. The reading δ gives a strained and unnatural construction to ἀντίτυπον and βάπτισμα, as well as makes water indirectly a saving means; whereas ψ makes a God-honoring desire to receive a divinely instituted ordinance in the exercise of faith in a buried and risen Saviour, which that ordinance symbolizes, the means of salvation.

iv. 1.

Rec. T. παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί — hath suffered for us in the flesh.

Rev. T. παθόντος σαρκί — suffered in the flesh.

In support of the received reading, we have $\aleph$ (its seventh-century corrector simply changing ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν), A, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Memphitic Version, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, Didymus, Epiphanius twice, Athanasius four times, Basil, Cyril twice, Theodoret, Ps.-Athanasius, Augustine, and Jerome. This reading is confirmed by $\aleph$ first hand, 31, and a few other cursives, the Peshito Syriac, Theophylact, and Eecumenius, which have ὑμῶν, "you," instead of ἡμῶν, "us," — a reading which was probably introduced as an intended correction of ἡμῶν, because of the use of the

pronoun of the second person in the closely related clause that follows. The omission of "for us" appears in B, C, three cursives (one of them calling for the omission in the margin), the Vulgate, the Thebaic, Athanasius according to some manuscripts, Theodoret after having once given the full reading, John Damascene, Œcumenius in commenting on the passage, Augustine in other places than the fore-mentioned, Ambrose, and Fulgentius. This omission, however, is plainly due in part to what was considered the needlessness of the phrase, as it is not found in connection with the same words in the next clause, but more especially because of what was deemed the seeming impropriety of connecting pronouns of the first and second persons in the manner in which they are brought together here, — παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Forasmuch as Christ "suffered for *us* in the flesh, do *ye* also," etc. If the expression were not genuine, it could hardly have got into the text in that shape, and become so generally accepted. The readings that differ from this plainly indicate a desire to rid the text, in one way or another, of an obnoxious phrase.

The marginal reading here, of ἀμαρτίας, "unto sins," in place of ἁμαρτίας, "sin," appears in **Σ** as changed early in the seventh century, B, one cursive, and the Ethiopic Version. It is a very natural transcriptional error, resulting from the position of the word after πέπανται, the writing of which seems to have left an impression that misled the scribe in writing this word. As far as we are aware, this false reading is adopted only by Westcott and Hort, among modern editors.

iv. 14.

The Revised Text and Version omit the closing words of this verse: "on their part indeed he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified." This omission is favored by **Σ**, A, B, less than twenty cursives, some copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian,

the Ethiopic, Erpenius' Arabic, and Tertullian. But the words are attested by K, L, P, by far the greater part of the cursives, three copies of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Cyprian, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. The language is, to say the least, in perfect harmony with the context. It may even be said to be the necessary complement of the thought introduced in the former part of the verse. The words might very easily have been omitted by *homoioteleuton*. They form just three of the ordinary lines of an uncial manuscript, counting fourteen letters to a line. Let us suppose that a line began with *εταί*, the last four letters of ἀναπαύ-*εταί*, which precedes this sentence. If the omitted words followed, they would fill out just three lines, and leave the same four letters, the last of the word δοξάζ-*εταί* to begin the third line below the first *εταί*. Now, in copying, the eye of the scribe, after he had written ἀναπαύ, on returning to the exemplar, might very easily have rested on the lower instead of the upper *εταί*, and gone on from that, and so lost the intervening three lines. Such omissions appear again and again in all the old manuscripts. And this certainly looks very much like one of them. The words, however, have been widely preserved; and, instead of continuing to omit them, we should hold to them all the more firmly. Let us see how the verse reads with this clause attached: "If ye are reproached for the name of Christ (*i.e.* on the score of being Christians), ye are happy (*i.e.* ye are fortunate, it is a good thing, a blessed thing for you); for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you. On their part, it is true, he is blasphemed; but, as far as ye are concerned, he is glorified" by it. The particle μὲν, "indeed," should not be overlooked. It is equivalent to our concessive phrase, "it is true,"—admitting the force of the statement with which it is connected, and at the same time adding weight by the contrast to the statement that follows. The sentence is just in the line of the apostle's argument, and cannot be omitted without detriment.

V. 2.

Rec. T. *ἐκουσίως, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς* — willingly; not for filthy lucre.

Rev. T. *ἐκουσίως κατὰ Θεόν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς* — willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre.

The omission of *κατὰ Θεόν* in the Received Text is according to B, K, L, most of the cursives, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, Mai's Extracts, Œcumenius, and others. Its presence is attested by *Σ*, A, P, about twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Antiochus, and Theophylact. The former reading is followed by Griesbach, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and others; the latter, by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and the Revisers. But *κατὰ Θεόν* is a transparent gloss, originally written on the margin, in explanation of *ἐκουσίως*, — showing that this was understood to mean "according to *God's* will." Afterwards, it was introduced into the text, generally as the Revisers have it. Some, however, placed it after *προθύμως*, "cheerfully," or, "of a ready mind." Others inserted other words, also, in connection with it, at the close of the verse.

Ἐπισκοποῦντες, "exercising the oversight," which is referred to in the marginal note, is omitted by *Σ*, B, two cursives, and three or four Fathers only. Of these, the testimony of the two uncials is all that carries any weight; and of these two witnesses, B omits verse 3 also. Until we can see some good reason for this latter omission, in which B stands alone, we can have very little confidence in the testimony of that document here, even though attended by half a dozen other witnesses, against a word which is all but overwhelmingly attested, if not plainly demanded by the context.

I JOHN.

i. 4.

Rec. T. *ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη.* — these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.

Rev. T. *ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη.* — these things we write, that our joy may be fulfilled.

In support of the Revisers' emphatic *ἡμεῖς*, we have *Σ*, A first hand, B, P, 13, one manuscript of the Vulgate (though this is afterwards changed), and the Thebaic Version. The corresponding *ὑμῖν* of the Received Text is attested by A as afterwards corrected, C, K, L, every cursive save one, a catena, the Vulgate, both Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. No doubt, the former is the harder of these readings; but its hardness is of an unreasonable kind. For there is no call whatever for an emphatic "we" here, as if some one else, whose words, perhaps, needed confuting or confirming, had been writing to those to whom the epistle was addressed. This pronoun is not introduced in any of the preceding verses, not even in connection with the verbs in the first verse, where the writer might appropriately have said, "which *we ourselves* have heard," if no more. The reading, doubtless, resulted from carelessly mistaking YMEN for HMEIC. This would readily, and, if there had been any indistinctness in the copy, all the more readily, have occurred just after the scribe had written *γράφομεν*, we "write," — the word being taken as the subject of that verb. — In the other case, the common reading, "*your* joy," is attested by A, C, K, P, most of the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian,

the Ethiopic, Augustine, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in their citations of the text. The reading "*our* joy" is attested by **S**, B, L, less than thirty cursives, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, Erpenius' Arabic, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in commenting on the passage. (The Peshito Syriac and Erpenius' Arabic also add ἐν ὑμῖν, making the apostle say "that *our* joy *in you* may be full.") This reading is simply an itacism, naturally resulting from the previous verb, "we write,"—some having afterwards thought it necessary, in order to make the meaning clear, to supplement it by adding "in you." Such a reading misrepresents the true *end* the writer had in view as indicated by the clause introduced by ἵνα, however true it might be that his own joy would be increased *as a result* of his writing. Indeed, such an utterance as "that *our* (my) joy may be full" could hardly have proceeded from the pen of one who thought more of imparting joy to others than of being filled with joy himself,—a lesson which he had many years before, according to his own record, learned from the lips of his blessed Master: "*These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.*" John xv. 11. That "*your* joy" is the true reading here, appears from the fact that the clause in which it stands follows on naturally as a fuller statement of the apostle's meaning in verse 3: "What we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, *that ye also may have fellowship* with us"; "and these things we write unto you, *that your joy may be full.*" It corresponds with the whole tenor of the epistle: "These things write I unto you, *that ye sin not*"; ii. 1. "I write unto you, fathers, *because ye* have known him . . . unto you, young men, *because ye* have overcome . . . unto you, little children, *because ye* have known" etc. ii. 13, 14, 21. "These things have I written unto you . . . *that ye* may know" etc. It is on their account, for their benefit, for their rejoicing, not on his own account or for his own greater joy, that he writes. The obvious purpose of the epistle was to

impart a fulness of joy to its readers. When the apostle himself assures us of this, we do him great injustice to give heed to fallible and fallacious documents, however innocent they may be in their misrepresentations, rather than to his own repeated declarations and the necessary conclusions that follow from them.

iii. 5.

Rec. T. ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ, — to take away our sins.

Rev. T. ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ, — to take away sins.

The reading of the Received Text is attested by **S**, C, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, Athanasius, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. The other is the reading of A, B, P, five or six cursives, five manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Tertullian, Fulgentius, and other Latin Fathers. If the reading were "to take away *sin*," we should expect the omission of the pronoun. And so Augustine writes the word here — *peccatum* — without the pronoun. But it is not John's habit to use the plural "sins" without a limiting word. See John viii. 24, xx. 23, 1 John i. 9, ii. 2, 12, iv. 10, Rev. i. 5, xviii. 4, 5. Aside from the present verse, these are all the passages, except John ix. 34, in which he uses the word in the plural; and in this last, the language is not his, but that of others. The documentary evidence for the pronoun leads us to believe it to be genuine; and when we couple with this the fact that the apostle again and again employs this pronoun to denote believers in general, we need not hesitate about accepting it as such. It is in perfect accordance with his usual mode of speaking, while the phrasing, "to take away *sins*," without any limiting adjunct, is not his way of expressing himself at all. The omission seems to be due, if not to oversight, to a desire to generalize the thought, as if the pronoun limited the meaning of "sins" to the apostle and his readers.

iii. 14.

Rec. T. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. — He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.

Rev. T. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. — He that loveth not abideth in death.

The received reading is attested by C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Memphitic, Woide's Thebaic, both Syriac Versions, the Ethiopic, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and Cassiodorus. The revised is vouched for by **Σ**, A, B, three cursives, the Vulgate, Münster's Thebaic, the Armenian, Didymus, Lucifer, and Augustine. Instead of τὸν ἀδελφόν being a later addition, as some suppose, its absence looks more like an early omission. If the apostle really meant that one who does not love a true Christian abides in death, he must have written, "He that loveth not his brother." But, if he meant to say in general terms that he who has no spiritual love, — no love either for God, or for men as Christians or beings for whom Christ died, — is still in a state of spiritual death, he must have omitted the words that follow in the next verse. The testimony of the documents being contradictory and nearly equally balanced, we are left to appeal to the text for additional evidence, if there is any. Here, in only the preceding sentence, we find the apostle saying, "We know that we have passed from death to life because we *love the brethren*." Now, after having written this, it is hardly possible for him to have said, "He that doth not love, abideth in death," and then to have added in the very next breath, "Every one that *hateth his brother*, is a murderer." After having written, "He that *loveth not*, abideth in death," he would naturally, if not of necessity, have written, "He *that hateth*, is a murderer," — a truth, no doubt; but not just the truth to which he gave utterance. The context evidently enough calls for "He that *loveth not his brother*, abideth in death." But some critical reader of the second century, under the impression that the apostle had drawn the lines a

little too taut, and that very possibly he had brought the matter too near home for his own satisfaction, desired to tone down the thought. Hence the offensive expression was erased, and a comparatively pointless but orthodox generality made to take its place. That such was actually the case, we are satisfied by a reference to the next sentence as it reads in B, one of the witnesses in favor of this depraved reading. That sentence, in only that one manuscript, reads, "Every one that hateth *his own* [ἐαυτοῦ instead of αὐτοῦ, "his"] brother, is a murderer." To retain the expression as the apostle wrote it seemed to our ancient critic to be too comprehensive. But to cut out the words "his brother" here, — "He that hateth, is a murderer," — would make the sentence still more sweeping. Hence the substitution of "his own" for "his," — making the apostle say, "Every one that hateth his own brother, his own mother's son, is a murderer, — leaving the reader to console himself with the thought that he may possibly hate some brother Christian, and yet not be a murderer. The omission of "his brother" in verse 14, and this change in B, of "his" to "his own," in verse 15, are evidently the work of the same hand, though the former was less palpable, and so became a comparatively widespread reading, while the latter scarcely went beyond its originator.

iv. 20.

Rec. T. πῶς δύναται ἀγαπᾶν; — how can he love?

Rev. T. οὐ δύναται ἀγαπᾶν. — cannot love.

The first of these readings is supported by A, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, John Damascene, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Cyril, and Augustine. The second is attested by **Σ**, B, six cursives (one of them by a second hand), the Thebaic and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Lucifer. We see no reason why this should supersede the common reading. It is simply an early attempt to improve

upon the apostle's way of expressing himself. In iii. 17, he shows how he prefers to word his own thoughts: "Whoso hath this world's goods, etc., . . . how dwelleth the love of God in him?" Instead of this last clause, he might have said, "the love of God dwelleth not in him." But he did not. In his Gospel also this interrogative form of speech appears about ten times instead of a simple negative declaration. And, though it occurs in language attributed to others, it was one of John's peculiar ways of writing. Hence, though he might have written "he cannot love God," his *usus loquendi* leads us to believe that he did not do it, but that he expressed himself more forcibly, and said, "how can he love God?"—leaving the question to answer itself. If the Revisers' reading had been the original reading, probably no one would have thought of changing it.

v. 7.

This verse is omitted by the Revisers without comment. It is now generally regarded by critical scholars as an interpolation. The only Greek manuscripts in which it is found are Codices 34 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, a fifteenth or sixteenth century cursive; 110, a sixteenth-century manuscript of the whole New Testament, but of no authority whatever, it being merely a copy of the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot; and 162 (of the Acts) of the fifteenth century. Besides these, 173 (Acts), an eleventh-century manuscript, has the omitted passage in the margin by a recent hand. The only versions that really support it are the Latin; and these are by no means united. The words seem to have been placed originally in the margin of an African copy of the Latin Version as a gloss on verse 8, whence they afterward crept into the text of other copies, and from them into two or three of the latest of the Greek manuscripts. They cannot be successfully defended as a part of the original text.

v. 18.

Rec. T. ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρεῖ ἑαυτὸν, — he that is begotten of God keepeth himself.

Rev. T. ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρεῖ αὐτόν, — he that was begotten of God keepeth him.

The former of these readings is attested by **Σ**, A (the original scribe, after having written αὐτόν, finding that he had erred, at once wrote a small uncial ε over the α of αὐτόν, and so changed the word to ἑαυτόν),¹ K, L, P, every cursive but one, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Origen three times, Ephraem Syrus twice, Didymus four times, Severus, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others. It is favored even by the rendering of the Vulgate, *sed generatio Dei servat eum*, "but a divine birth (or, his being begotten of God) keeps him." The other reading is attested only by B and one cursive. And even B's testimony is questionable. Its reading may be either αὐτόν, "him," or αὐτόν, "himself." In Matt. vi. 34, where all other witnesses, including the sixth or seventh century corrector of B, read ἐαυτῆς, B as given by its scribe, together with L and Δ, reads αὐτης, the breathing and accent being wanting. But with the rough breathing, αὐτῆς, it is only another mode of spelling ἐαυτῆς, as Westcott and Hort regard it. So in Luke xii. 17, B and L first hand read ἐν αὐτῷ, where all other manuscripts have ἐν ἑαυτῷ; and Westcott and Hort give it as ἐν αὐτῷ, "in himself." In verse 21 of the same chapter, **Σ** first hand, B, L, and a single lectionary read αὐτῷ (Westcott and Hort, αὐτῷ), where all others read ἑαυτῷ. In Luke xxiii. 2, B, G, T, and a single cursive read αὐτόν, where all other documents have ἑαυτόν, which

¹ Scrivener, after speaking of "the fact that αὐτόν is corrected into ἑαυτόν by the original scribe," — *Introduction*, p. 655, — adds in a footnote, "So it seems to me after careful inspection of Codex A." This statement, from one so thoroughly versed in the reading of New-Testament manuscripts, may be regarded as altogether trustworthy.

is also Westcott and Hort's reading. But in verse 12, these editors read *αἰρούς* (with the rough breathing), following the spelling of **Σ**, B, L, T, and a few cursives. (It might be said in passing, that Codex L, as well as Δ, is very much given to writing the word in this abridged form, often standing alone in doing it.) In Luke xxiv. 12, B, L read *αυτον* (Westcott and Hort *αὐτόν*), where all others read *ἐαυτόν*. In John ii. 24, there is a strange confusion, and intermixture of readings. While the great majority of witnesses, including Origen twice, and Cyril, as well as **Σ** third hand, and A second hand, read *ἐαυτόν αὐτοῖς*, *i.e.* Jesus did not trust "himself to them," **Σ** first hand, B, L, one cursive, Origen once, and Cyril once, read *αυτον* (which Westcott and Hort make *αὐτόν*) *αὐτοῖς*, but A and Codex 253 read *αὐτόν ἐαυτοῖς*, *i.e.* "him to themselves," — completely reversing things. In John xx. 10, **Σ** first hand, B, L, read *αυτους* (Westcott and Hort *αὐρούς*), where all the other fifteen uncials, together with **Σ** as corrected early in the seventh century, every cursive, Chrysostom, and Cyril read *ἐαυτούς*. (Compare Note on John xiii. 32.) We might fill pages with additional examples from the older manuscripts of these departures from general later usage. But, we presume, we have already given enough to satisfy any candid reader that, though the scribes of B and other ancient manuscripts may have written *αυτω*, *αυτον*, *αυτης*, etc., we are not necessarily to understand them as having written the personal pronoun. The earlier manuscripts are generally without accents and breathings. And these forms, from being often written *ἐφ' αυτον*, *μεθ' αυτου*, etc., as well as from the connection in which they stand, indicate clearly that they were pronounced with the aspirate, and employed as the abbreviated forms of the reflexive. This is true of the reading *αὐτῷ*, as Westcott and Hort give it, in the tenth verse of this chapter, which the Revisers write *αὐτῷ*, and translate "him." It is simply the shorter form of writing the *ἐαυτῷ* which they have rejected, though the latter is well attested, especially by ancient versions, which render it by the reflexive

"himself." So in the verse before us; the word is not *αὐτόν*, but *αὐτόν*. The reading *ἐαυτόν*, the testimony for which far exceeds that in favor of the abbreviated form, is no doubt the true reading, and should be retained, as it is by the American portion of the Revisers. This reading harmonizes perfectly with Scripture teachings elsewhere. With this reading, all the supposed difficulties, as well as the fanciful and contradictory interpretations of the verse disappear. These interpretations; at best, are mere expedients by which to explain and bolster up, if possible, a false text, and are all unsatisfactory because not founded on the truth. One of these fanciful readings is, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but the begotten (*i.e.* the only-begotten Son) of God keepeth him; and the evil one toucheth him not." Another is, "He that hath been begotten of God, *it* keepeth him"; *i.e.* the fact that one has been born of God preserves him that is regenerated. This, in substance, is the rendering of the Vulgate, and the interpretation of the Latin Fathers. But the Greek text gives no countenance to such a view. Another interpretation is, "He that has been begotten of God (*i.e.* a regenerate person) keepeth him (*i.e.* keepeth God, keeps him in constant, living union with himself); and the evil one toucheth him not"; *i.e.* does not touch God, and by not being able to touch God, does not touch his children. Another view, differing from this last only in the latter part of the verse, is, that the evil one toucheth not the regenerate person, — the "him" after "toucheth" being referred, not to God, but to the person who keeps God in union with himself. But the idea of *our keeping God* is hardly scriptural. On the contrary, it is God that keeps us, not we that keep him. (Compare *Psa.* xli. 1, 2; *xcvii.* 10; *cxxi.* 3-8; *Prov.* xxiv. 12; *Isa.* xxvii. 3; *John* xvii. 11, 15.) Of himself, the Saviour says (*John* x. 11), "I am the good Shepherd"; and a shepherd, we all know, is a *keeper* of sheep, — those whom the good Shepherd keeps being the sheep of God's pasture. The Saviour himself says of his disciples (*John* xvii.

12), "I kept them in thy name." But, however true it is that the Saviour is, in the highest sense of the word, the keeper, the guardian, the preserver of the redeemed, the idea that $\delta \gammaεννηθείς$ here denotes the Son of God is an unwarranted one. It is the term $\delta \muονογενής$, "the only-begotten," that is so often applied to Christ. John uses it in only the preceding chapter, verse 9; and, if his reference here had been to Christ, he would unquestionably have used the words $\delta \muονογενής υἱός$, "the only-begotten Son." In Gal. iv. 29, $\delta \gammaεννηθείς$, "he that was born," is used in connection with the phrase "after the flesh," concerning Ishmael. Here, in connection with the phrase "of God," it is used, plainly enough, of a regenerate person, one "born of God," as in iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, and in this very verse, in the words, $\delta γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ$, "he that hath been born of God." The only difference between the two is that, in the original, the one participle is in the perfect, and as such refers to the life of the regenerate person subsequent to his regeneration; while the other, the aorist participle, points more especially back to the time of his regeneration. No such distinction, however, can be made in the English rendering. Nor is it essential, as the two mean the same thing. What we need in order to see the apostle's real meaning, is to translate the verse correctly, if possible, in every particular. We will offer first a translation, then say a few words in regard to certain points connected with it. "We know that no one that is born of God sinneth; yea, he that hath been born of God keepeth himself, and the evil one harmeth him not." The verse consists of two parts. The first is a general statement: "We know that no one that is born of God sinneth." This is only repeating what the apostle had already said in iii. 9. His reference is solely to the new man, the divine nature implanted in man at his regeneration. This, being a nature begotten of God, is *holy*; in its bent, desires, purposes, aims, and acts, it sinneth not. It is a principle of holiness as well as life. The rest of the verse presents only another phase of the same

thought. It is introduced by $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$. This, however, is not adversative in meaning here. There is no opposition in thought between the sentence it introduces and the one preceding. On the contrary, it enforces and confirms the same truth. Hence $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ needs to be translated "yea," as in John xvi. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 15, Phil. ii. 17, and a number of other places: "Yea, he keepeth himself," *i.e.* from sin. This holy principle, the new and divine nature in the regenerate, has no affinity for sin; on the contrary, it repels it, and so keeps the evil one at a distance. In verse 4 of this very chapter, the apostle speaks of the offspring of this divine birth, not as a person, but as a principle, a thing: "*Whatsoever* is born of God overcometh the world." This includes not only the germ of holiness implanted and quickened into being by the Spirit through the truth, but the faith, the love for divine things, the new hope in reference to God and eternal objects, the spirit of forgiveness, of patient endurance of wrong, and every spiritual grace conferred upon the regenerate. These constitute the new man, the Christ that is formed in us; and this new creation keepeth itself. But the apostle, viewing the man himself as under the dominant power of this holy principle, very naturally speaks of him as "keeping himself." The Apostle Paul expresses the same truth in 1 Tim. v. 22, in a hortatory form, "*Keep thyself pure.*" The Apostle James also (i. 27) speaks of the child of God as "*keeping himself* unspotted from the world." Jude, too (verse 21), says, "*Keep yourselves* in the love of God." And John himself concludes his epistle with saying, "Little children, *keep yourselves* from idols."

2 JOHN.

Verse 8.

Rec. T. ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσωμεν τὰ ἐργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβωμεν. — that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive [a full reward].

Rev. T. ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσῃτε τὰ ἐργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβῃτε. — that ye lose not the things which we have wrought, but that ye receive [a full reward].

In support of the first of these readings, we have K, L, P, 31, most of the other cursives, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in their quotations from the text. The second is the reading attested by B and the Thebaic Version only, — that adopted by Westcott and Hort. There is also a third reading, with all the verbs in the second person; namely, See “that ye lose not what ye have wrought out (or obtained by working), but that ye receive a full reward.” This is attested by **Σ**, A, ten cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Lucifer, Isidore of Pelusium, John Damascene, and others; while Theophylact and Œcumenius in their commentaries refer to it as the reading of some. The weight of evidence, both internal and external, is decidedly against both the common and the revised reading, and calls for this third reading, which is that of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles in his text, the Revisers in their margin, and which is adopted by the best modern commentators.

JUDE.

Verse 22.

Rec. T. καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, — And of some have compassion, making a difference.

Rev. T. καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινόμενους, — And on some have mercy, who are in doubt.

The text of this and the following verse in the old manuscripts is in a sad state of confusion, so that it is by no means easy to determine what the true reading is. It seems clear, however, that there are *three* classes of persons spoken of in these verses, as the R. V. indicates, and not two only, as the A. V. would lead one to suppose. The presenting of but two classes by the latter is due, as will soon be seen, to the omission of certain words in verse 23. In attestation of the nominative διακρινόμενοι, in the verse before us, we have K, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, Theophylact and Œcumenius, each in citing the text. The accusative of the Revised Text is the reading of **Σ**, A, B, C, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, Clement, Ephraem Syrus, Jerome of course, Cassiodorus, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in their comments on the passage. The nominative, therefore, has no support from external evidence of the earliest date. It will be observed, however, that in verse 23 the adjuncts ἀρπάζοντες, “snatching,” or “pulling,” and μισοῦντες, “hating,” are in the nominative, and refer, not to the objects, but to the subjects, of the preceding verbs. This leads us to conclude that the author of the epistle probably wrote the nominative here, as in the following instances, giving direction thereby how those whom he is addressing should per-

form the duty enjoined upon them. On account of the early corruption of the text, it is not to be wondered at if, in the ignorance or uncertainty that existed concerning the writer's meaning, a false reading became more prevalent than the true one. — Now, respecting the other word, ἐλεῖτε, or, as the Revised Text has it, ἐλεᾶτε, it is very questionable whether this is really the right word here. The American Revisers say, in a marginal note, "Some ancient authorities read, *And some refute*," instead of, "And on some have compassion." That is, ἐλέγχετε appears instead of ἐλεῖτε in A, C first hand, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Ephraem Syrus, Cassiodorus, Theophylact and (Ecumenius in their commentaries, as well as in Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, and an early scholiast. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford adopt this as the true reading, as does Huther also; and Tregelles gives it the preference. The objection to it is that, on account of the presence of ἐλεῖτε in the next verse as well as here, some early corrector of the text may be supposed to have substituted ἐλέγχετε for it in this place, while some other corrector, retaining ἐλεῖτε here, omitted it in verse 23. But this is only an objection in appearance. Let us assume that ἐλέγχετε is the original reading here, and ἐλεῖτε or ἐλεᾶτε in the next verse, and only there. Let us now suppose, what is perfectly supposable, and by no means improbable, that, in an early exemplar from which a scribe was copying, a line ended with ἐλε-, the first part of ἐλέγχετε, and that the fourth line after this also ended with the same letters, being in this case the first three letters of the other word. (The intermediate fifty-five letters would make just four lines.) A copyist, having reached the end of the first of these lines, on returning to his exemplar, might have glanced at the lower line, then hastily passed to the left side of the page or column he was copying from for the rest of the word, and carelessly finished it off with εῖτε or ᾶτε, instead of γχετε; then, returning to his proper place without observing his error, he would have gone on with

the next word, διακρινόμενοι. This will account for the omission of ἐλέγχετε, and the appearance in its place of ἐλεῖτε. After the latter word had obtained currency, some one, naturally objecting to its two-fold appearance, omitted it, with two or three other words, from the next verse, and so gave rise to the reading of the Received Text. The reading ἐλέγχετε is certainly well supported, especially by early versions and patristic testimony. It is also clearly called for on internal grounds. It presents to us not only three different classes of persons to be dealt with, but three different modes of dealing with them. Adopting it, therefore, in place of either the received or the revised reading, and reading instead καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινόμενοι, we have what seems to be, as far as we can ascertain from the confused state of the documents, the writer's thought in these two verses. He is exhorting his readers respecting the course they should pursue in reference to those members of the church who had been and still were more or less under the influence of false teachers. And he says: "And some put to shame by confuting them; but others save by plucking them out of the fire; and others deal compassionately with, in fear, abhorring even the garment contaminated by the flesh."

REVELATION.

i. 5.

IN the familiar clause, "and washed us from our sins in his own blood," the word *λούσαντι*, "washed," is set aside by the Revisers, and *λύσαντι*, "loosed," inserted instead, with the marginal note, that many authorities, some ancient, read, "washed." This familiar reading is attested by B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, both forms of the Ethiopic, Andreas, and Arethas. The other is the reading of *Σ*, A, C, ten or more cursives, the Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Primasius. The Revisers are doubtless right in making the change. When we consider that "the blood of Christ" is only another way of saying "the death of Christ," there is no difficulty in seeing that the apostle must have written "and loosed us from our sins by his blood"; *i.e.* set us free, or opened the way for our deliverance, from sin by laying down his life. The same idea in a slightly varied form is presented in v. 9: "Thou wast slain, and didst redeem us unto God with thy blood out of every tribe," etc. But some early reader, probably having vii. 14 in mind, and possibly 1 John i. 7, took the preposition *ἐν* in its primary sense of "in," instead of considering it the accompaniment of an instrumental dative, in the sense of "by" or "with," and naturally enough considered *λύσαντι*, "loosed," an error for *λούσαντι*, "washed," and so changed the original reading. But the revised reading is in perfect accord with Acts xx. 28, Eph. i. 7, ii. 13, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, and other passages.

i. 15.

Rec. T. *πεπυρωμένοι* — they burned.

Rev. T. *πεπυρωμένης* — it had been refined.

The former is the reading of B, P, most of the cursives, Andreas, and Arethas. It cannot be the true reading, for *feet burning* in a furnace could hardly be represented as glowing like burnished brass. They would very soon be consumed. The other reading is attested by A, C, only. It is an unmeaning reading, out of all grammatical harmony with the context, and utterly untranslatable. The true reading seems to be that adopted by Tischendorf, — *πεπυρωμένῳ*, "burning," referring to *χαλκολιβάνῳ*, "burnished brass." It is attested by *Σ*, at least four cursives, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Cyprian, Victorinus, Primasius, and others. The conjecture of Dürstiedick, in his critical note on the passage, that *πεπυρωμένης* is a clerical error for *πεπυρωμένη*, a form in support of which there is not the least documentary evidence, is of no weight whatever. It proceeds on the assumption that *χαλκολιβάνῳ*, a word used nowhere but here and in ii. 18, is feminine; while John doubtless viewed it as a masculine, like *χαλκός*, "brass," and *λίβανος*, "frankincense," out of which he probably coined the word, though it is commonly regarded as a neuter.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. *Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Ἐφεισίνης ἐκκλησίας* — Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus.

Rev. T. *Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας* — To the angel of the church in Ephesus.

The Revisers' reading of the second article, though attested by A and C, — and these are the only known ancient witnesses for it, — is simply a stupid mechanical repetition of the dative form preceding. If it means anything, it is not what the R. V.

gives us, but "Unto the angel that is in Ephesus, concerning the church," write. The true reading is *τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας*, "of the church in Ephesus," — corresponding to the addresses to the other churches, and attested by **Σ**, B, P, all the cursives, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. The same blundering scribe probably changed the text in the same way in verse 8, — "To the angel that is in Smyrna." The same change was also attempted in verse 18, and is preserved to us in Codex A, the leading "authority" that we have for this false reading in this first verse, and the only one for it in verse 8. The Revelator's form of address was one and the same to all the seven churches. And so, Tischendorf and others give it.

ii. 13.

Rec. T. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός*, — in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr.

Rev. T. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς μου, ὁ πιστός μου*, — in the days of Antipas, my witness, my faithful one.

The reading, *ἐν αἷς*, of the Received Text, is attested by the earlier seventh-century emendator of **Σ**, P, eight or ten cursives, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. It is also favored by the reading *αἷς* without the preposition, found in B, more than forty cursives, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, both forms of the Ethiopic, and the fourth-century treatise, *Questiones ex utroque Testamento*. The *ἐν αἷς*, or possibly the simple *αἷς*, was early lost from some copies in consequence of the preceding *ἡμέραις*, having the same ending, — a case of *homoioteuton*. The revised reading is that of A, C, the Vulgate, the Memphitic Version, and Bishop Haymo, of the ninth century. The Clementine Vulgate, two of the three Leipsic copies of the Apocalypse in Latin, and Primasius, read "in those days," without *in quibus*, "in which," following. The Revisers say in the margin that the Greek text here "is somewhat uncertain." That is, if we understand the note, they

are themselves in doubt whether the revised text is the true text. And no wonder; for, after having omitted *αἷς*, which is essential to the construction and is also well attested, they found it necessary to represent the nominative *Ἀντίπας* in English as a genitive by translating it "of Antipas," — to say nothing of the insertion of *μου* after *πιστός*, which, though found in A, C, and two cursives, is wanting in **Σ**, the oldest of all the manuscripts, as well as in B, P, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, Memphitic, and Ethiopic Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. A and C certainly are not infallible, as we have already seen from their attestation of "the meaningless error," *πεπυρωμένης*, in i. 15. Not only is the received reading the correct one here, but it is sufficiently attested as such to be more safely accepted than rejected, especially when, by rejecting it, we make an incoherent text, which it is impossible to believe to be genuine, or to translate.

ii. 17.

Here, in place of *τῷ νικῶντι*, "to him that overcometh," A and C have *τῷ νικούντι*, a false form, as if from a verb in *-έω* instead of from one in *-άω*. Yet Tischendorf adopts it. The same false spelling appears also in A at verse 7, which Lachmann adopts; and again in C at xv. 2, where we find *νικούντας* for *νικῶντας*, "those that are victorious." These forms can be attributed only to the ignorance of scribes; and they show that the old manuscripts especially, since they are more confided in than later ones, need to be closely and continually scrutinized.

iii. 2.

Rec. T. *οὐ . . . εὗρηκά σου τὰ ἔργα* — I have not found thy works.

Rev. T. *οὐ . . . εὗρηκά σου ἔργα* — I have found no works of thine.

In connection with this revised rendering is the note that many ancient authorities read, "I have not found thy works."

That is, they present the received reading, adopted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others. This commonly accepted reading is attested by **Σ**, B, P, nearly every cursive, the versions generally, Andreas, and Arethas. The other, which is adopted by Lachmann and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers, is the reading of A, C, and the margin of Codex 1, a twelfth-century cursive. It is plainly an attempt to make the apostle's language more definite. The phrase σου τὰ ἔργα, "thy works," which appears, also, in the preceding verse, and wherever else in the Apocalypse σου is coupled with ἔργα, was considered too general an expression, and forming an unsuitable subject for the accompanying predication. Hence the omission of τὰ to render the statement more explicit. But the omission is too feebly attested to be allowed to set aside what is well known to be a genuine form of speech with the apostle.

iv. 1, 7, 8; v. 6.

The received readings, λέγουσα, ἔχον, λέγοντα, etc., found in these verses and elsewhere, are undoubtedly critical emendations to make the participle correspond in gender with the nouns with which they are construed, as φωνή, ζῶον, ἀρνίον, ζῶα, etc. Whereas, the readings, λέγων, ἔχων, λέγοντες, etc., which the Revisers have substituted instead, while not in grammatical accord with the nouns with which they are to be taken, are the genuine readings, given in the masculine rather than the feminine or the neuter, on account of their being referred by the writer himself to the *intelligences* symbolized by the feminine or neuter nouns employed, — their hidden meaning rather than their grammatical character governing the writer's thought and pen. This is the only way of accounting for these apparently anomalous forms, which cannot reasonably be attributed to error on the part of transcribers, or to emendation on the part of critics. The following are also examples of the same nature. Chapter v. 12, ἄξιος . . . τὸ ἀρνίον (Tischendorf, and Westcott

and Hort in the margin, but not the Revisers, after Codex A) ; xi. 4, λυχνίαι . . . ἑστῶτες, symbolizing the teachers and the receivers of the truth ; xi. 15, φωναὶ . . . λέγοντες, the "voices" representing the angelic hosts of heaven ; xiv. 19, τὴν ληνὸν . . . τὸν μέγαν (Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles in the text, and Westcott and Hort, after A, B, C, P, more than twenty cursives, and Arethas, but not adopted by the Revisers), symbolizing those whom God employs as instruments in carrying out his purpose ; xxi. 14, τὸ τεῖχος . . . ἔχων, the wall being a part of the holy city symbolizing the bride, the Lamb's wife, or the risen and glorified saints. Quite analogous to these, and to be accounted for in the same way, is the combination τῷ θηρίῳ (neuter) ὅς, "the beast *who*," xiii. 14, — that beast symbolizing a body of tyrannical rulers.

v. 9.

Rec. T. ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου — thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.

Rev. T. ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου — thou didst purchase unto God with thy blood *men*.

The former reading is attested by **Σ**, B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Augustine, Fulgentius, Andreas, Haymo, Arethas, Primasius, and others. In some of these, however, τῷ Θεῷ follows ἡμᾶς instead of preceding it, while in others it is altogether wanting. This is simply due to the fact that τῷ Θεῷ was omitted by one of the ancient scribes in copying, as several documents still attest, and that in restoring it to the text it was misplaced, — having been inserted after instead of before ἡμᾶς. This, however, does not militate in the least against the genuineness of ἡμᾶς. The Revisers' reading, which omits ἡμᾶς, is attested only by A and the Ethiopic Version ; while the eleventh-century cursive 44 has ἡμῶν ("to *our* God") in place of ἡμᾶς. (This, however, may be merely a transcrip-

tional error.) The word was no doubt omitted on account of the αὐτοῦς, "them," in the next verse, with which "us" was supposed to be inconsistent; and at the same time, βασιλεύσομεν, "we shall reign," in verse 10, which is demanded both by ἡμᾶς here, and by the closing words of iv. 1, was changed to βασιλεύσουσιν, "they shall reign," which Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others adopt, and afterwards to βασιλεύουσιν, "they reign," which Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers adopt. That "us" is a proper reading is seen in the fact that the song in which it occurs was shared by "the four-and-twenty elders," who represent redeemed and glorified saints; while "them," in the tenth verse, is not inappropriate as referring to the same persons, after they have been spoken of as redeemed "out of every *tribe*, and *tongue*, and *people*, and *nation*,"—the words "*and* madest *them*" being equivalent to "*whom* thou didst make," if expressed in idiomatic English. This would perhaps be the best rendering for καὶ αὐτοῦς here, as the Revisers themselves have translated these words in Mark i. 19. (Compare, also, Note on Mark i. 19, in *The Revisers' English Text*.) The two verses would then read, "And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open its seals, for thou wast slain, and didst redeem us unto God by thy blood out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation; whom thou didst make to be to our God kings and priests; and they shall reign upon the earth."

vi. 1.

The Revisers' rendering, "as *with a voice* of thunder," does not indicate that the corresponding Greek word in their text is φωνῇ, — a nominative. This rendering of the nominative is justifiable in Acts xix. 34; but here "with a voice" can only be a legitimate rendering for the dative φωνῇ, — there being nothing in the context to make it an allowable rendering for the nominative. Some of the later documents give the form φωνῆ; but the older ones are without either accents, or the

iota whether ascript or subscript. Even the cursive manuscripts generally either omit this iota entirely, or pay but little attention to its insertion, far more frequently omitting it than inserting it. This may account for the want of "authority" not only for φωνῇ here, but for γῆ in Matt. ii. 6. The earliest known manuscript of the New Testament that contains an subscript dates from the latter half of the twelfth century. In view of all which, it seems to us perfectly justifiable, because demanded by the context, to write φωνῇ here. (Compare viii. 13.)

vi. 17.

Rec. T. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, — the great day of his wrath.

Rev. T. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν, — the great day of their wrath.

The singular form of the pronoun in this verse is vouched for by A, B, P, every known cursive but one, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, the four forms of Andreas' Commentary, Arethas, and Primasius. The plural, adopted by the Revisers, is given by **Σ**, C, one cursive, the Vulgate and Syriac Versions, the author of the fourth-century work *De Promissionibus Dimid. Temporis*, Fulgentius, Haymo, and some others. The documentary evidence is thus divided, with an apparent preponderance in favor of the common reading. The expression "their wrath" of course means the wrath of "him that sitteth upon the throne," as well as that of the Lamb, just mentioned. But the reference of the writer seems to be to the immediately preceding statement concerning "the wrath of the Lamb" only. It looks as if some early reviser had changed "his" to "their," because the general New-Testament phraseology speaks of the divine wrath as the wrath *of God*,¹ which

¹ John iii. 36; Rom. i. 18, ix. 22, xii. 19, impliedly; Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6; Heb. iii. 11, iv. 3; Rev. xi. 18, xvi. 19, xix. 15.

he would include with the wrath of the Lamb here. In verse 16, however, men are represented as crying to be hidden from the *face* of God and from the *wrath* of the Lamb, as two distinct things. Then, as a reason why they desire to escape from the latter, it is added, "because the great day of *his* wrath is come." This is natural, and just what the author might be supposed to have written. It is also favored by the documentary evidence, and is accepted as the true reading by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf in his seventh edition (though in his eighth he abandons it for the reading of his favorite Sinaitic Codex), and by most modern commentators.

xi. 5.

Rec. T. εἰ τις αὐτοὺς θέλη ἀδικῆσαι, — if any man will hurt them.

Rev. T. εἰ τις θελήσῃ αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι, — if any man shall desire to hurt them.

The common reading θέλη is almost without support. The revised θελήσῃ is the reading of **Σ** and A only. The true reading seems to be θέλει, the reading of B, C, P, nearly all the cursives, Andreas, Arethas, and Primasius. It is the true reading in the first clause of the verse, as admitted by the Revisers; and there is no reason why they should not have employed the same form here. It would have been unnatural for the apostle to have framed the two clauses differently for no apparent reason. Some critical reader or careless copyist must have mistaken the meaning, and changed the language. But the original text is abundantly supported. Θέλει should be read in both clauses of the verse, with its corresponding English, "purposeth," or "desireth." Then, if καί is, as it seems to be, intended to emphasize what follows, it should be rendered "yea," as the Revisers have rendered it, for example, in John xvi. 32. The verse, properly translated, would then be, "And if any one desireth to hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies; yea, if any one desireth to hurt them,

thus must he be destroyed;" *i.e.* not in any ordinary way, but by their fearless, truthful utterances. The language is symbolic.

xi. 8, 9.

Rec. T. τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν — their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies.

Rev. T. τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν — their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies.

To the first two of these renderings in the Revised Version is attached the marginal note "*Gr. carcase*"; that is to say, the corresponding Greek in the Revisers' Text in those two instances is in the singular, and denotes a corpse, a dead body, not corpses or dead bodies. In the third instance, it will be observed, their reading corresponds with that of the received text. It is in the plural. This plural is attested as genuine by all the documents, with the single exception of Cursive 14, which reads τὸ σῶμα, "body," and one manuscript of Andreas, which has τὰ σῶματα, "bodies" (probably a transcriptional error), while all his other manuscripts read τὰ πτώματα. The received reading, aside from this, is attested, in the first instance in which the word occurs, by **Σ**, P, ten or twelve cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Andreas, Victorinus, Primasius, and others; in the second instance, by the same witnesses except **Σ**, one manuscript of Andreas, and Victorinus. The singular form, given in the Revised Text, is attested, in the first instance, by A, B, C, thirty-five cursives, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Egyptian Versions, Arethas, and others; in the second, by the same witnesses, together with **Σ** and one manuscript of Andreas. But this reading is palpably false, and by no means inexplicable. We say palpably false; for no sane person, speaking of the remains of these or any other witnesses, in penning only forty-five words, would twice mention those remains as a corpse, and immediately after as corpses. The Revisers themselves find it impossible to do it. Notwithstand-

ing their Greek text, which is supposed to present the original, God-given language of the Revelator, they reject it, and say successively, with King James's Revisers, "their dead bodies." Why, then, should they have adopted that text? Simply because of devotion to manuscript "authority" on the part of a few of their number. It was not because that text was essential to a revision of the English text. It was not because it is incredible that John could have done otherwise than twice speak of two (or more) dead bodies as one, then the third time express himself in regard to them as the rest of mankind would; as their English Version plainly indicates. It was not because the Greek singular τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν means "their dead bodies," as if it could be taken collectively, with De Wette, to mean "that which has fallen of them"; *i.e.* their corpses — a use of the word altogether unwarranted and unwarrantable. It was not that the plural form might be interpreted as meaning that each of the witnesses had more than one body or one corpse, as one would naturally interpret the words "their ears" in the clause "Their ears are dull of hearing"; any more than one might possibly interpret in a similar manner the expression "their consciences" in such a phrase as "being convicted by their consciences." Nor was it because there is no evidence that John wrote the plural in each of these three instances. It was simply owing to undue deference to the testimony of fallible and depraved documents. Textual critics have been too ready to say that the correction of the singular into the plural shows that offence was taken at the singular. But the truth is, strange as it may seem, no such offence was ever taken. The "correction" so-called, that is, the change which the genuine text has undergone, has been wholly the other way: offence was taken at the *plural*. The witnesses, whose dead bodies are spoken of, are represented in verse 4 as olive-trees and candlesticks. To some ancient critic, who took πτώμα in its primary sense of "a fall," the sense in which the word is perhaps most commonly used by classical writers, the thought of "the corpses" of olive-

trees and candlesticks, no doubt, seemed absurd, the obvious result of a misunderstanding of the apostle's meaning. Then, in order to restore what he considered the original text, he changed the plural to the singular, making the apostle say, "And their *fall* shall be on (or in) the street of the great city," etc., and . . . "nations shall witness (or behold) their *fall* (or defeat) for three days and a half." But, the third time the word occurs, he was under the absolute necessity of leaving it in the plural, because of the absurdity of saying that men shall not suffer "their *fall* to be *deposited in a tomb*." Not only does this show how the revised text arose, but it reveals the untrustworthy character of some of those to whom we are indebted for the Greek text of the New Testament, and to whom many in our day defer, even with profound reverence.

xi. 9, 10.

Rec. T. βλέψουσιν, shall see . . . ἀφήσουσι, shall suffer . . . χαροῦσιν, shall rejoice . . . εὐφρανθήσονται, shall make merry . . . πέμψουσιν, shall send.

Rev. T. βλέπουσιν, do look . . . ἀφίλουσι, suffer . . . χαίρουσιν, rejoice . . . εὐφραίνονται, make merry . . . πέμψουσιν, shall send.

In verse 7, as presented by both the Received and the Revised Text, we find three futures, — "shall make," "shall overcome," and "shall kill." Then follow the above verbs; the last of which, as given in both texts, is also a future. In regard to the other four verbs, there is an obvious difference in the time expressed, — the Received Text giving them in the future, and the Revised Text in the present. Yet there is no apparent reason why there should be this change from the future to the present on the part of four, or indeed of any, of these eight verbs. The context seems to call for the future in every instance, and no more in the last one and the first three than in the intermediate four. But the documents do not furnish as strong evidence in support of the future in the case of those

four as in that of the others. Tischendorf, on the testimony of **S** first hand, P, four cursives, a few manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and two manuscripts of Andreas, adopts the present *πέμπουσιν*, "send," in verse 10, instead of the future, "will send," consistently with the four preceding presents, all of which he adopts, as do the Revisers. The future, however, is far more strongly attested than the present. It is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of **S**, A, C, most of the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, most copies of Jerome's, the Memphitic and Syriac Versions, Primasius, and others. It is supported, also, as far as the tense is concerned, by B, thirty or more cursives, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, and Arethas' Commentary, all of which read, "will give," instead of "will send," gifts. The other four futures, of the Received Text, though not as strongly attested as the presents of the Revised, are no doubt genuine. It is by no means improbable that an early reader changed the five futures in these two verses into the historical present with a view to enliven the discourse. It certainly has that appearance. There is not a shadow of probability that the apostle varied his tenses as the Revised Text varies them. The internal evidence is wholly to the contrary.

xi. 18.

- Rec. T. τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλαις, — small and great.
 Rev. T. τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, — the small and the great.

These words are supposed to belong to the preceding expression *τοῖς φοβουμένοις*, and should properly be in the same case with it. The received reading here is that of a seventh-century corrector of **S**, B, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, Andreas, Arethas, Cyprian, Primasius, and others. Tischendorf, Düsterdieck, and others unhesitatingly adopt it as the genuine reading. The revised reading is that of **S** first hand, A, and C only. But A reads the accusative here because of its previous reading

τοὺς ἀγίους καὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους, an obvious transcriptional error for *τοῖς ἀγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις*. Through inattention on the part of scribes, the other two uncials unwittingly fell into the same error as far as the words cited above are concerned. To suppose the Apostle John to have been capable of committing this error is to entertain a most humiliating opinion of his ability as a writer of Greek, and an unwarranted estimate of the power of transcribers to keep from slips. The reading has really no claim to serious consideration. It is barely possible, but not very probable, that it originated in an attempt to make the language correspond, in part at least, with the reading of the Septuagint (Psa. cxv. 13), *εὐλόγησε τοὺς φοβουμένους τὸν Κύριον, τοὺς μικροὺς μετὰ τῶν μεγάλων*, "He will bless them that fear the Lord, the small with the great." Still, a recollection of this passage may have had some influence on the transcriber, and have been the means of leading him astray. But, whatever may have been its origin, it is obviously a false reading.

xiii. 1.

Rec. T. Καὶ ἐστάθην ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. — And I stood upon the sand of the sea.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. — and he stood upon the sand of the sea.

The first of these readings is attested by B, P, nearly all the cursives, the Memphitic Version, Erpenius' Arabic, Andreas, and Arethas; the second, by **S**, A, C, 87, 92, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Bishop Haymo. Those who hold to this reading regard the dragon as taking his stand by the sea in order to call forth the seven-headed beast, and to equip him with power. But this is being wise above what is written; for, while verse 2 shows that the dragon gave position, power and authority to the beast, he is not represented as having called the beast up out of the sea, or as being stationed on the shore for that purpose. The last that we read of the

dragon, previous to this verse, is that *he departed to make war with the woman's seed* (xii. 17). But, according to this reading, in the very next breath, before he has had time to do any fighting, he is standing upon the sand of the sea. This certainly does not give assurance of the genuineness of the reading. And when we consider that a scribe, who has just recorded a statement respecting the dragon, and finds no other subject introduced, on coming to *ἐστράθη* would very naturally refer it to the dragon, and without due attention write it in the third person singular, — simply omitting the last letter of the word, — we can very easily see how this reading should have crept in. This makes the apostle say, "And the dragon waxed wroth with the woman, and departed to make war with the rest of her seed (such as keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus), and stood upon the sand of the sea." Thus no time is allowed the dragon to do any warring before he is on the seashore. And if he is there to bestow power and government upon the seven-headed beast, it is difficult to see when he wages the warfare he is said to have gone forth to wage. We are told, however, that he is to employ the beast as his instrument in the conflict he has undertaken. But is there anything to warrant this interpretation? All that we are apparently justified in concluding from the text is that the beast derived its power and authority from the dragon; *i.e.* it inherited the same spirit, and was empowered to accomplish the same unhallowed ends. As a consequence, similar homage and worship were given to both the beast and the dragon. Now if we understand, with the Received Text, Tischendorf, and others, that John instead of the dragon stood on the sand of the shore, we allow an indefinite period of time between the departing of the dragon (xii. 17) and the coming up of the beast mentioned in xiii. 1. And not only this; we also see the significance of John's standing by the sea; namely, that he might have a full view of the beast coming up out of the water. The obvious intent of the former statement is to show that the

apostle is in a proper position to witness and report the next scene presented to him.

xiii. 7.

The omission of the first half of this verse, referred to in the marginal note, occurs in A, C, P, four cursives, Zohrab's Armenian Version, two manuscripts of Andreas, and Irenæus as represented by his Latin interpreter. It is not, however, because the clause is spurious, or of questionable genuineness in any degree. The omission is due simply to the ever-recurring transcriptional error of *homoioteleuton*, the transcriber's eye, in copying, having passed unconsciously from *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ*, "and it was given to him," at the beginning of the clause, to the same words at the beginning of the next clause, causing him to leave the intermediate words unwritten. And from one copy the omission passed into others, — thus indicating a kind of relationship between certain manuscripts.

xiii. 8.

Rec. T. *ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα* — whose names are not written.

Rev. T. *οὗ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* — every one whose name hath not been written.

The *τὸ ὄνομα*, of the Revised Text (without the Hebraistic *αὐτοῦ* following it, which is found only in A, C) seems to be the true reading, and not *τὰ ὀνόματα*. But the relative *ὧν*, referring back to *πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες*, "all who dwell," has been improperly changed to *οὗ*. The former is attested by *Σ*, B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. The latter is attested only by C, and the Latin interpreter of Irenæus. A reads *οὐαί*, — a clerical blunder, of course, but perhaps for *οὗ οὐ*. The singular form (*οὗ*) of the relative grew out of the singular *τὸ ὄνομα* limited by it, — the expression, "all persons whose *name* is not written," appearing inappro-

priate, or, at all events, less appropriate than "every one whose name is not written." Others, instead of changing ὦν to οὗ, were led by this seeming impropriety to substitute the plural τὰ ὀνόματα, of the Received Text, for the singular τὸ ὄνομα, which the Revisers read, according to A, B, C, forty or more cursives, the Memphitic and Syriac Versions, three manuscripts of Andreas, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, and Augustine. The plural appears in **Σ**, P, four cursives, the Vulgate, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Arethas, Primasius, Haymo, and one manuscript of Andreas. The singular, however, is the more strongly attested, and must be regarded as the true reading. (Compare xvii. 8.)

xiii. 10.

Rec. T. Ἐὰν τις αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει. — He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity.

Rev. T. εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει. — If any man is for captivity, into captivity he goeth.

The received reading here is unsupported by any known Greek manuscript. Codex 33 omits the preposition before the first αἰχμαλωσίαν, but reads ἀπάγει instead of συνάγει immediately after; while 35, and one manuscript of Andreas give very nearly the same reading. The revised reading is that of A, three copies of the Vulgate, and a Slavonic manuscript, which of course is of comparatively recent date. The uncials, **Σ**, B, C, P, and four of the best cursives, 28, 38, 79, 95, read simply εἰ (though C has ἡ here) τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει (B alone reading ὑπάγη). But, as far as we are aware, only Tregelles among modern editors ventures to accept this as the true reading. It is generally thought that the second αἰχμαλωσίαν with its accompanying preposition is omitted in these manuscripts by *homoioteleuton*; which is possible, and by no means improbable. This is the position taken by nearly all modern editors. But why limit the omission to these two words? If, as there is

ground for believing, the original reading was εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει (or ἀπάγει, as several documents read), εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει, we see no reason why the absence of συνάγει (or ἀπάγει) from the leading manuscripts may not be accounted for in this way just as well as that of the remaining two words. By restoring this word as well as the other two, and taking the verb as a present used *de conatu* as in John x. 32, xiii. 6, and elsewhere, we obtain this as the meaning of the clause: "If any one would lead (or would lead away) into captivity, into captivity he goeth"; that is, as a necessary consequence. It will be observed that this reading obviates the necessity, which the Revisers found themselves under, of giving the preposition εἰς two different meanings in identical and close connections. The reading of A (adopted by the Revisers) seems to be this reading only partially restored. It is a significant fact that it is found in no other Greek manuscript.

In the second clause of the verse, Westcott and Hort give the present ἀποκτείνει in the margin as a secondary and possibly genuine reading in place of the future ἀποκτενεῖ, "shall kill." This present is attested by **Σ**, 28, 79, while B, 26, 87, though spelling the word as a future, accent it as a present, as if it were considered such by the scribes of those manuscripts. Taken as a present again used *de conatu*, it yields an excellent meaning: "If any one would kill with the sword, with the sword must he be killed." And this, we are inclined to think, is the original reading. It puts this clause in harmony with the preceding, and makes the two yield not only an intelligible, but what seems to be in every respect a satisfactory sense: "If any one would lead into captivity, into captivity he goeth; if any one would kill with the sword, with the sword must he be killed." That is, if, in times of persecution and bloodshed, one would resist his oppressors, and seek to *lead* them *with* himself (or, would attempt to subdue them and carry them away) into captivity, he but places himself in a position to be led into captivity; or if, in other words, he would take the

sword in hand to resist them, he must expect to perish by the sword. In meekly continuing to fulfil their duties as Christians, and in calmly yielding if necessary rather than resisting when thus tried, the saints show their patience and the faith they have in God. "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

xiii. 15.

Rec. T. ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι — he had power to give life unto the image.

Rev. T. ἐδόθη αὐτῇ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι — it was given *unto him* to give breath to it, *even* to the image.

The received reading is attested by **X**, B, P second hand, all the cursives, Hippolytus, Andreas, and Arethas; the Revisers', by A, C, P first hand. This reading seems to have been adopted, not because it is more strongly attested than the other, but because it is a more difficult reading, and probably the Revisers as a body could not withstand Dr. Hort's arguments in its favor. Not another instance can be found in the Apocalypse in which the apostle uses this aorist passive (ἐδόθη) without giving also in close connection with it the dative denoting the receiver of the thing given. This shows the apostle's manner of using the word; and we may safely infer from it how he expressed himself here. It is vain to think for a moment that αὐτῇ may denote the receiver but that the Revisers have mistaken the construction. The only true rendering for the words — "It was given *to her* [or, *to it*] to give life to the image," — is meaningless. There is nothing in the preceding context to which the word can possibly be referred as an antecedent, notwithstanding Dr. Hort's vague surmisings concerning the earth. It is scarcely possible that the apostle could have so far departed from his ordinary *usus loquendi* as not only to omit giving the dative denoting the recipient, but to give in its place a word that is absolutely uncalled-for and purposeless. By turning to the context, we discover the probable origin of

this strange reading. We find that the careless copyist had just written ἐδόθη, and the impression which the last letter of this word made on his mind led him, as he wrote the succeeding word, to finish this, too, with the same letter. Yet Dr. Hort says: "It is impossible either to account for the text [*i.e.* for αὐτῇ] as a corruption of αὐτῷ, or to interpret it as it stands."¹ Still, though a confessedly impossible reading, it must be admitted in the face of an appropriate and even better attested reading to be a part of the genuine text! Thus these blunders are introduced, one after another, under false principles, or rather under principles of criticism which within reasonable limits may be perfectly just and safe, but, when pressed to extremes, end in giving us spurious readings and gross absurdities.

xiv. 13.

Rec. T. τὰ δὲ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ — and their works do follow.

Rev. T. τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ — for their works follow.

The received reading here is attested by B, most of the cursives, Andreas, and Arethas; while the older manuscripts **X**, A, C, P, four cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Augustine, Primasius, and others support the revised reading. If we were left to be governed simply by documentary evidence, we should be compelled to adopt γὰρ as the genuine reading. But this word has the suspicious appearance of being a gloss; while the true meaning of the passage demands δέ. The latter was apparently set aside in consequence of a misapprehension of the real import of the words, resulting from a false view of scriptural truth; namely, that one's good deeds are the ground or source of future blessedness: for the object of γὰρ is evidently to introduce a reason for the blessedness of those who die in the Lord, — namely, because their works follow with them; *i.e.* as De Wette expresses it, "the memory of their deeds."

¹ See *Select Readings*, p. 138.

This virtually makes their future reward consist in their past works rather than in their continued faithfulness, obedience, and activity in the service of God. In contrast with this, the apostle was commanded to write, "Blessed henceforth are the dead who die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, [who die] so as to rest from their labors; but their works follow with them." Their toils, their tears, their sorrows, their sufferings are over; they *rest* from these. But their works of obedience, holy ministry, love, and gratitude continue; they follow, and flow from them continually. They that die in the Lord, so far from resting from these, are blest; they cease not from their service or worship day or night. Rev. iv. 8; vii. 15. Their blessedness consists in part in cessation from toils and trouble, but mainly in the perfect service of God as his loyal, loving, redeemed subjects.

XV. 3.

Rec. T. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἁγίων. — thou King of saints.

Rev. T. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων. — thou King of the ages.

The reading, ἁγίων, of the Received Text, is virtually without support. The revised reading is attested by **X** first hand, C, two cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, a few copies of Jerome's, the Syriac Version, Erpenius' Arabic, the margin of Usan's Armenian, Haymo, and others. This is the title which the Apostle Paul assigns to God in 1 Tim. i. 17, — "the King eternal." It is adopted by Westcott and Hort as the true reading here. And yet the marginal reading, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν, "Thou King of nations," which is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and placed by Westcott and Hort in the margin as a secondary reading, is more probably the original reading. It is well attested by **X**'s seventh-century corrector, A, B, P, nearly fifty cursives, the Memphitic, Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Primasius. It harmonizes, also, with what follows: . . . "all nations shall come and worship before thee." These vari-

ations seem to be due to the partial obliteration of the original word in some early manuscript, in trying to restore which, one gave one word, another another.

XV. 6.

Rec. T. ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον καθαρὸν καὶ λαμπρὸν, — clothed in pure and white linen.

Rev. T. ἐνδεδυμένοι λίθον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν, — arrayed with *precious* stone, pure and bright.

The common reading λίνον is supported by B, P, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Syriac and Armenian Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. The Revisers' is the reading of A, C, three cursives and the margin of a fourth, and several manuscripts of the Vulgate. The Sinaitic Codex (not, as some suppose, on account of the difficulty presented by λίθον, but because there are seven angels spoken of as "clothed") gives the *plural*, καθαρὸς λίνους, "clean linen garments," — in which reading it is accompanied by the Memphitic Version. The Ethiopic Version and Erpenius' Arabic are without any corresponding word. It is plain that λίθον, presenting us with angels clothed in stone, is an impossible reading; but the weight of the testimony in support of it is thought by some to be too great to be set aside. Hence, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, and others adopt it. Tregelles does not venture to reject it, but accepts it hesitatingly. Tischendorf, Alford, and others, however, read λίνον, with the Received Text. It is true that λίνον is nowhere else in the New Testament used in the sense of linen. Aside from this passage, it is found only in Matt. xii. 20; and there it denotes the raw material, flax. But is "stone" mentioned in any other passage of the New Testament, or indeed in any other writing, as clothing material, even for human beings, to say nothing of angels? The Revisers virtually repudiate their own reading; for, instead of faithfully translating it as it should be trans-

lated, "clothed in clean, bright stone," they render it "arrayed with *precious* stone, pure *and* bright," interpolating the words "precious" and "and." (The former word is a part of the text in xvii. 4, xviii. 12, 16, xxi. 19, and is employed with "stone" in speaking of ornaments and ornamentation.) Then, to give the word still more plausibility, the Revisers change the simple word "clothed" to the ambiguous vocable "arrayed," which includes the idea of decking and adorning as well as of clothing. (Compare Matt. vi. 29; Acts xii. 21; Rev. xvii. 4; xviii. 16. Also Rev. xi. 3, where "arrayed" would be altogether inappropriate.) The reading they have adopted finds no justification in the Septuagint rendering of Ezek. xxviii. 13. The two cases are altogether different. The prophet refers to the manner in which the king and people of Tyre displayed their pride and ostentation. But the apostle is speaking of the dress of angels. There is no similarity between the characters, the circumstances, or the expressions employed in reference to them. In the one case, mention is made of the extravagant adornment of the person with all manner of costly stones: "With every precious stone (*πᾶν λίθον χρῆστον*) hast thou been attired,—with the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper," etc.,—language that is neither unnatural nor unreasonable. In the other, it is the material in which angels are clothed that is spoken of, which, according to this reading, is "clean, bright stone,"—material seemingly altogether unsuitable for angels' apparel. If nothing else convinced us that *λίθον* was a transcriptional error,—probably the result of carrying the next word along with this in the mind at the time,—the combination "clean stone," as clothing material, would be enough. The word "clean" is not only redundant, but an altogether unsuitable epithet for "stone" thus employed.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. *θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμον ὀνομάτων βλασφημίας*,—a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy.

Rev. T. *θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας*,—a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy.

The reading *ὀνομάτων*, of the Received Text, is but feebly supported, being attested by only twelve or fifteen cursives, Hippolytus, Andreas, and Arethas. That of the Revised Text, *γέμοντα ὀνόματα*, is attested possibly by *Σ* first hand, A, 13, and 19, certainly by P; while *Σ* as afterwards corrected, B, and twenty-five or thirty cursives read *γέμον ὀνόματα*; and three or four cursives read *γέμων ὀνόματα*. The word with which *γέμον* (or *γέμοντα*) is to be construed is the neuter *θηρίον* just preceding. And as the neuter *ἔχον* follows immediately after, and belongs to the same neuter noun, it is better with Lachmann, Tregelles, Düsterdieck, and others, to take the *γέμοντα* of *Σ* and A as two words, *γέμον τά*. This gives three neuter adjuncts in succession limiting the neuter *θηρίον*,—a reading which is perfectly natural, and commends itself as genuine. It is by no means probable that the apostle wrote first a neuter adjective *κόκκινον*, then a masculine, then a neuter again, as the Revised Text makes it appear that he wrote. The reading of Lachmann and Tregelles, as far as *γέμον* is concerned, it will be observed, is that of *Σ* corrected, B, and twenty-five or more cursives; but these witnesses all omit the article *τά* following. This article seems necessary to indicate a reference to the names of blasphemy mentioned in xiii. 1, where this beast first appears. If, however, the reading with three neuter adjuncts is not the original reading, we should say with Tischendorf that *γέμοντα . . . ἔχοντα* is the true reading rather than *γέμοντα . . . ἔχον*, as the Revisers have it. In that case, the two masculine adjuncts would be accounted for on the principle mentioned in our note on iv. 7. But that the apostle, after having introduced the masculine adjective *γέμοντα*, should return to a neuter adjunct in *ἔχον* is incredible.

xviii. 3.

Rec. T. *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου . . . πέπωκε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, — for all nations have drunk of the wine.

Rev. T. *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου . . . πέπτωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, — for by the wine . . . all the nations are fallen.

The received reading, *πέπωκε*, adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by P, twenty-five or more cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Armenian, Hippolytus, Andreas, Arethas, Haymo, and others. The other reading *πέπτωκαν*, is that of A, C, from ten to fifteen cursives, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions; while *Σ*, B, read the regular third person plural *πεπτώκασιν* instead of the Alexandrian. Four cursives read *πεπότικε* "have become drunk," — taken probably from xiv. 8. The difference in spelling between *πέπωκαν* and *πέπτωκαν* is but slight, the one having a letter which the other is without. But the difference in meaning is greater. It is not because the weight of manuscript authority is in favor of the former that Tischendorf and others adopt it, but because internal evidence calls for it. On turning to xiv. 8, we find it said that Babylon has fallen because she has "made all nations *drink* of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." The same sacred penman would naturally say here, "Babylon is fallen, because all nations have *drunk* of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." However natural it might be to say, "have fallen *from drunkenness*," one could scarcely say, "have fallen from wine." The simple truth is that the revised reading is an erroneous one. It was unconsciously introduced by some early scribe in consequence of the impression made on his mind by the twice-used word *ἔπεσεν*, "is fallen, is fallen," in the preceding verse. Just so in John vii. 6, the scribe of B was betrayed by the preceding *πάρεστιν* into writing this word for *ἐστίν* at the close of the verse, and, in giving John xiv. 16, the scribe of *Σ* wrote *τηρήσω*, "I will keep," for *ἐρωτήσω*, "I will ask," because of the impression that *τηρήσετε*, the last word of the preceding

verse, made on his mind. This is by no means an uncommon source of error in transcribing. The writer of these pages himself many years ago, in transcribing a sentence from Macaulay, wrote it as follows: "The history of Charles V. is both a less valuable and a less interesting both than the Lives of the Poets." A few years afterwards, on reverting to his manuscript, he observed the error, but could not correct it without turning to the volume from which he had taken the sentence. By going thither, however, he saw at once that the undue prominence given in his thoughts to the point he was aiming to illustrate had caused him unwittingly to write "both," for "book." So here; the impression made by "has fallen, has fallen," in verse 2, on the copyist's mind probably led him unconsciously to write "have fallen," in place of "have drunk"; and the fact that the error comes down to us through our oldest extant manuscripts makes it no less an error, and should have no weight in deciding upon the true reading.

xviii. 7.

Rec. T. *ἐδόξασεν ἑαυτήν* — she hath glorified herself.

Rev. T. *ἐδόξασεν αὐτήν* — she glorified herself.

The Revisers have here set aside the Greek reflexive, and substituted the personal pronoun, because the uncials, with the exception of *Σ* as written by its earlier seventh-century emendator, give the abbreviated spelling. If this is the true spelling of the word here, we insist, either that it should have the rough breathing, as Westcott and Hort give it, or that it be properly rendered "her," and not as if it were the reflexive. To reject the Greek reflexive, and give the Greek personal pronoun for the purpose of preparing the way for a faithful English rendering, then mistranslate it as a reflexive, looks very much like revision work that is not merely unnecessary, but sadly in need of re-revision.

xviii. 19.

Rec. T. ἔκραζον — cried.

Rev. T. ἔκραξαν — cried.

The imperfect of the Received Text is adopted by Tischendorf, Düsterdieck, and others, both here and in verse 18. Here it is attested by **Σ**, B, P, all the cursives but one, and by Andreas and Arethas. It is similarly vouched for as the true reading in verse 18. The aorist of the Revised Text is attested by A, C, 35, and Hippolytus. This is the form adopted by Lachmann and by Westcott and Hort. But the verb has the appearance of having been changed to the aorist to correspond in tense with ἐβαλον, "they cast"; while the imperfect is apparently the original form, employed to denote an action *contemporaneous* with that expressed by the preceding verb, while the "crying" denoted by it was also in all probability prolonged and repeated. All this would naturally require the imperfect, the form found in the Received Text. Nothing but a less probably genuine reading is gained by adopting the aorist.

xix. 13.

Rec. T. ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι — a vesture dipped in blood.

Rev. T. ἱμάτιον ρεραντισμένον αἵματι — a garment sprinkled with blood.

The received reading βεβαμμένον is that of A, B, most of the cursives, three manuscripts of Andreas, and Arethas. The revised reading is that of P, 36; while four other cursives, Hippolytus, Origen, and one manuscript of Andreas read ἐρραντισμένον; and a late corrector of **Σ** gives περιρεραντισμένον, which is adopted by Tischendorf; and still others read ἐρραμένον. The Latin versions and Fathers generally read *aspersa*, *conspersa*, or *spersa*; but just what Greek word any one of these represents, it is impossible to say. The mere fact that the idea of a garment "sprinkled" with blood appears in so many differ-

ent forms affords good reason for suspecting and rejecting the readings that embody it. The other reading, however, is unique and well attested. It is accepted, also, as the true reading by Lachmann, Tregelles, Düsterdieck, and modern editors and commentators generally, as far as we know.

xx. 6.

A marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities read *the*"; i.e. "the thousand years," as in verse 7, instead of "a thousand years," as in verse 4, where the expression first appears in connection with these souls. The reading of the text, without the article, is attested by A, most of the cursives, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. That of the margin, calling for the article, is supported by **Σ**, B, 14, 18, 38, 47, 92, and the Syriac Version. It is also what might be expected from the writer of the Apocalypse. In verse 2 of this chapter, in first giving the time during which he represents Satan as being bound, he says "a thousand years." But, in referring to that period in the next verse, his words are "until *the* thousand years" should be completed. So here, in first mentioning the time that the souls lived and reigned, the apostle says "a thousand years." But in verses 5 and 7 the same time is referred to as "the thousand years." It is hardly to be supposed that, as he employed the article just before and just after, in this connection, he would have omitted it here in speaking of the same period of time. In view of all the evidence presented to us, we should be disposed, with Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and others, to insert the article as clearly a part of the original text.

xx. 9.

Rec. T. ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, — from God out of heaven.

Rev. T. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, — out of heaven.

The Revisers reject from the text the phrase "from God," then add the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities insert

from God." The witnesses in support of the received reading are the early seventh-century corrector of **S**, P, 7, and a number of other cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, and Jerome; as well as the three cursives, 1, 17, 19, and one manuscript of Andreas, which have ἀπό, "from," instead of ἐκ, "out of," heaven. The shorter reading of the Revisers' Text is attested by A, three cursives, the three Leipsic Latin copies (4, 5, 6) of the Apocalypse, another manuscript of Andreas, Tichonius the Donatist once, and Primasius. This reading, however, appears to be a clipping down of the original, under the idea that the phrase "from God" was superfluous in connection with the expression "out of heaven." The Demidovian manuscript of the Vulgate, on the other hand, rejects "out of heaven," and reads only, *a Deo*, "from God." This manuscript of the twelfth century, as far as we are aware, is the only extant representative of this old reading, which originated, like the Revisers', in the supposition that the use of both expressions was pleonastic, — only it omits the latter instead of the former of the two phrases. The reading of B, twenty-five or more cursives, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and Erpenius' Arabic Version, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, Arethas, Victorinus, Augustine, and Tichonius in another place only indicates an early attempt to give the two phrases in the order found in xxi. 2, 10. Similar work of omission and of transposition of the terms to make them correspond with the reading here was attempted by some in xxi. 2, 10; but it was not followed to the same extent as it was in trying to bring this reading into conformity with that. There can be but little if any doubt that the original reading embraces both phrases as given in the Received Text, while their collocation indicates that the reading was not borrowed from chapter xxi. The former expression represents the origin or source of the fire, as "from God"; and the latter, the place whence it proceeded, — "out of heaven."

xxi. 3.

"Some ancient authorities omit, and be *their God*," says the marginal note. That is, these two words are wanting in **S**, B, 1, 7, 8, 29, 39, 92, and twenty-five or more cursives, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic Version, Irenæus, two manuscripts of Andreas, Arethas, Augustine, Primasius, and Haymo. Hence, Tischendorf rejects them, and Westcott and Hort consign them to the margin. But evidently they were early dropped as superfluous or inappropriate. So far, however, from being really superfluous or inappropriate, they need to have a special stress laid upon them, — God himself will be with them as *their God*, — denoting the intimately close, tender, hallowed and unchanging relation that is to subsist between him and them, — a relation even more tender and hallowed than the same phrase implies in the Old Testament in reference to the Israelites under Moses and his successors. A failure to recognize the true force of the term led to its omission from some early manuscript. But its genuineness is sufficiently attested by A, P, 79, and a number of other cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Irenæus in another place, Ambrose, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, and Tichonius.

xxii. 16.

The Revisers have done well in leaving unchanged, and without any alternative marginal reading, the words ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις; and in translating them "for the churches," by which they have corrected the false rendering of Tyndale and the A. V., — "in the churches." The marginal note, "Gr. *over*," might, however, much better have been omitted, as well as many other similar ones; for ἐπὶ with the dative means "for" sometimes, as truly as "over" at other times. Griesbach and Westcott and Hort place ἐν, "in," or "among," in their margins as a possibly genuine reading instead of ἐπὶ. This

reading is found in A, four cursives, the Vulgate, Athanasius, and two manuscripts of Andreas. But it has no claim to acceptance. It evidently arose from a misunderstanding of ἐπί, and from perplexity in regard to the meaning of that preposition. Düsterdieck and others consider the true reading to be ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, without any preposition, — a reading that is attested by seven or eight cursives, the Armenian Version, Arethas, and two other manuscripts of Andreas. But if this, which can mean only, "for the churches," had been the original reading, the other forms would never have been suggested, especially the form ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, which is attested by **Σ**, B, most of the cursives, the Syriac Version, and one manuscript of Andreas. In the proper application of the rule that a difficult reading is more likely to be genuine than an easy one, this is "the harder reading" as compared with either of the other two. That the clause is correctly rendered, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things *for* the churches," *i.e.* on account of, or on behalf of, the churches, is evident from a reference to chapter i. 1, 4, 11.

I. GENERAL INDEX.

[The numbers i. and ii. denote the volume; the letter n. refers to the foot-notes.]

- Abbot, Ezra, LL.D., Critical Essays of, noted, ii. 12, 45 n.; quoted, ii. 246.
- Abbreviations, incorrect reading of, i. 23, 356, ii. 164.
- "Abiathar," readings in connection with, i. 36.
- Address, use of direct *versus* indirect, i. 236, ii. 79.
- Agrippa, words of, ii. 131.
- Alford, Dean Henry, D.D., adherence of, to received readings, i. 83, 91, 92, 95, 116, ii. 46, 90, 179, 237, 245, 266, 270, 282, 319; received readings rejected by, i. 76, 84, 319, 322, 326, 329, ii. 72, 165, 234, 265, 296; quoted, i. 271.
- "Amen," genuineness of, considered, ii. 220, 253.
- American Committee of N. T. Revisers, adherence of, to *Textus Receptus*, i. 143, 313, ii. 44, 66, 147, 201, 214, 259, 264, 266, 291; marginal readings adopted into text by, ii. 33, 106, 265; marginal note omitted by, ii. 134; marginal readings suggested by, ii. 262, 296.
- Angel, troubling of water by, considered, ii. 22.
- Anomalous Readings, i. 332, 350, ii. 15, 50, 74, 77, 123, 124, 127, 174, 218, 228, 299, 300, 302, 313.
- Aorist (Luke vii. 11), i. 283; improperly rejected, i. 341, 360, ii. 57, 232, 235.
- Apocalypse, early treatment of, i. 18; use of aorist in, ii. 316.
- Aquila, occupation of, ii. 118.
- Article, Greek, improperly omitted, i. 75, 143, 184, 213, ii. 14, 15, 121, 206, 247, 274, 301, 325; introducing indirect interrogative clauses, i. 225, and n. 4; improperly inserted, i. 138, 194, 197, 320, ii. 101, 116, 173, 231; with demonstrative pronoun, i. 350, ii. 15; falsely rendered, ii. 78; improperly used in Septuagint, ii. 94; improper form of, ii. 299.
- Augustine cited, i. 315, ii. 40.
- ἀγαπητός (Luke ix. 35), i. 296.
- ἀγρών, a false use of, i. 241.
- ἀδελφοί, use of, i. 59, 98.
- ἀελ (Mark xv. 8), i. 250.
- ἀθῶον (Matt. xxvii. 4), i. 161.
- αἶ, an omission of, considered, i. 305.
- Ἀγυπτος, always without the article, ii. 94.
- ἀκούειν, omission of, i. 90, 98.
- ἀκούσαντες (Luke viii. 12), i. 287.

ἀκούσας (Mark v. 36), i. 196.
 ἀκούσῃ, uncorrected, ii. 247.
 ἀμαρτήματος for κρῖσεως, considered, i. 191.
 ἀμαρτήσῃ (Matt. xviii. 15), i. 124.
 ἀμφίβληστρον, omission of, considered, i. 34.
 ἀμφοτέρων (Acts xix. 16), ii. 122; reference of, ii. 123.
 ἀναπτύξας (Luke iv. 17), i. 269.
 ἀνθρώπων (Matt. ix. 32), i. 85.
 ἀνθρώπῳ (Matt. xix. 3), i. 126.
 ἀνολίξας (Luke iv. 17), i. 269.
 ἀπήγαγον (Luke xxiii. 33), i. 334.
 ἀποστέλλει, a clerical error, illustrated, i. 238 n.
 ἀρτι (Matt. xxvi. 53), i. 160; (John i. 51), ii. 15.
 ἀρχαί, a frequent use of, ii. 158.
 αὐτοῖς (Luke viii. 3), i. 286.
 αὐτόν (Matt. xiv. 12), i. 102; (Mark ix. 26), i. 228.
 αὐτοῦ, changed in B to αὐτοῦς, i. 22; (Matt. xii. 46), i. 97; (Mark xiii. 27), i. 246; (Luke xix. 29), i. 321; a false reading for αὐτοῦς, ii. 113.
 αὐτῷ (Mark viii. 20), i. 215; (Luke v. 5), i. 273; (Rev. xiii. 15), ii. 316.

"Baptisms, the teaching of," ii. 259.
 Basle, Codex E (Gospels) in Public Library of, i. 9.
 Bede, the Venerable, cited, ii. 96, 119.
 Bengel, J. A., prime canon of, noted and illustrated, i. 48, 235, ii. 180.
 "Bethsaida" (Luke ix. 10), i. 295.
 Beza, Theodore, Codex D presented to Cambridge by, i. 9.

Biblical facts, a knowledge of, necessary, i. 4.
 Bloomfield, S. T., D.D., cited, i. 221.
 Bornemann, F. A., cited, ii. 111.
 Breathings, often misrepresented by copyists, ii. 45; generally omitted in the old Mss., ii. 63, 140, 290, 304.
 British and Foreign Bible Society, London, Codex Z in Library of, i. 11.
 British Museum, London, Codex A in, i. 9; Codices G (Gospels), N in part, and R, in, i. 10.
 Broadus, J. A., D.D., on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, ii. 73.
 Burgon, Dean J. W., on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, i. 255, 256, ii. 40; headings in volume on Mark xvi. 9-20, cited, i. 259 n.
 Burrus Afranius, ii. 139.
 Buttmann, Professor Alexander, cited, i. 42, 288 n., ii. 49, 72, 123, 146, 257, 259 n.
 Buttmann, Philip, cited, ii. 117.
 βαπτίζων (Mark i. 4), i. 173.
 βλέπεις (Mark viii. 23), i. 216.
 βληθῆς, unwarranted use of, i. 332.
 βληθῆ (Matt. v. 30), i. 66.

Cambridge, Codex D in University Library, i. 9; F (Epistles) in Library of Trinity College, i. 10; T* in University Library, i. 11.
 Changes, early made in one Gospel and not in another, i. 60.
 "Clauda," ii. 131.
 Claudius, Emperor, reign of, noted, ii. 139.

Clement V., Pope, decision of, at Council of Vienna, i. 165.
 Codices, account of, N, A, B, C, D, D (Epistles), E (Gospels), i. 9; E (Acts), E (Epistles), F (Gospels), F (Epistles), G (Gospels), G (Epistles), H (Gospels), H (Acts), H (Epistles), I, K (Gospels and Epistles), L (Gospels, Acts, and Epistles), M, N, P, Q, R, S, T, i. 10; T^b, to Z, Γ, Δ, Θ, Α, Ξ, Π, Σ, i. 11; Ψ, i. 39.
 Codex D, evidence respecting, i. 20; compared with older Mss., i. 20 n. 2; Latin version of, not always in agreement with Greek text of, i. 57, 180, ii. 259.
 Conflations. See "Readings, Conflated."
 Constantinople, chief seat of transcribers, i. 19.
 Constructio ad sensum, examples of, ii. 213, 223, 239, 302, 303.
 Copyists, errors of, noted, i. 84, 99, ii. 93; illustrated, ii. 82, 83 n. 1, 208 n., 235, 316; ignorance of, illustrated, ii. 301.
 Cornelius, fasting of, ii. 99.
 Cowper, William, quoted, i. 235.
 Criticism. See "Textual Criticism."
 Cyril of Alexandria quoted, ii. 53.
 Damascus, disciples at, not Paul's, ii. 96.
 Dative, a common N. T. use of, ii. 112.
 Davidson, Dr. Samuel, on internal evidence, i. 53.
 De conatu, verbs used, ii. 315.
 Demonstrative pronoun and article, i. 350, ii. 15.

De Wette, W. M. L., opinion of, i. 225, ii. 308; quoted, ii. 317.
 Dialessaron, Tatian's, omissions adopted from, i. 165, 334, 339.
 Digamma, as a symbol, i. 356, 358; often mistaken for gamma, i. 357, 358.
 Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, respecting early corrupters of the text, i. 17.
 Documents commonly deemed most trustworthy, i. 24; their character illustrated, i. 25-32, 33-44.
 Doxology, authorities, *pro* and *con*, i. 68; appropriateness of, i. 71.
 Dresden, Codex G (Epistles), in Royal Library of, i. 10.
 Dublin, Codex Z in Library of Trinity College, i. 11.
 Dusterdieck, Dr. Friedrich, conjecture of, ii. 299; readings adopted by, ii. 310, 321, 324; opinion of, ii. 327.
 Dwight, President Timothy, D.D., quoted, i. 234, 359.
 δέ, i. 326, ii. 60, 80, 124, 180, 206, 317.
 δεῦτε (Luke xx. 14), i. 322.
 δευτεροπρώτῳ (Luke vi. 1), force of, i. 278.
 διασάφισον (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.
 δυνάμεις (Rom. viii. 38), i. 23; proper place of, ii. 158.
 δυνάστακτα (Matt. xxiii. 4), i. 147.
 Edwards, Principal T. C., quoted, ii. 149 n. 1, 180.
 Egypt, Codex B referred to, i. 9.
 Elijah (Luke ix. 54), i. 298.
 Ellicott, Bishop C. J., on omissions

in Codex B, i. 66; reading of Gal. vi. 2 by, ii. 209.
 Epaphras, character of, ii. 221.
 Epistles, early treatment of, i. 18.
 Eusebius, omission by, in quoting Matt. iv. 24, i. 62; a false reading in, i. 67; on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 256.
 Eve, relation of, to Adam, ii. 216.
 ἔζησε (Luke xv. 32), a false reading, i. 316.
 ἐκῆ (Matt. v. 22), i. 65.
 εἰς, use of, in Mark i. 21, noted, i. 35; various readings from misapprehensions concerning, i. 84; improper omission of, ii. 88, 130; transcriptional error for εἰ, ii. 267; meaning of, in 1 Pet. iii. 21, ii. 279.
 εἰς σε (Luke xvii. 3), i. 317.
 εἰ τι (Matt. xviii. 28), i. 125.
 εἰχαν and ἔχουσι for ἔχομεν (Mark viii. 16), i. 213.
 ἐκεῖ (Mark i. 13), i. 175.
 ἐκλεπόντος (Luke xxiii. 45), i. 340.
 ἔκραξε (Matt. xiv. 30), i. 104.
 ἐλθεῖν (Matt. xiv. 29), i. 103.
 ἐμόν (Luke xvi. 12), i. 316.
 ἐν (Luke iv. 1), i. 267; (Luke xxiii. 42), i. 339; (Acts xi. 23), ii. 102.
 ἐνα (Luke xii. 25), i. 306.
 ἐν Ἐφῶσφ (Eph. i. 1), ii. 211.
 ἐνὸς αἵματος (Acts xvii. 26), ii. 118.
 ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ (Acts xii. 25), ii. 104.
 ἐπερώτημα, meaning of, ii. 279.
 ἔργων for τεχνῶν, i. 91.
 ἔρημος (Matt. xxiii. 38), i. 151; (Luke xiii. 35), i. 309.
 ἔτι (Mark viii. 17), i. 214; (Rom.

v. 6), ii. 151; (1 Tim. vi. 7), ii. 244.
 εὐθὺς (Mark i. 23), i. 177; (Mark ii. 2), i. 180; (Mark vii. 35), i. 212.
 ἔχετε (Matt. xvi. 8), i. 115.
 ἔχωμεν (Rom. v. 1), ii. 147.
 ἔως, a common use of, ii. 102.
 ἡ ἐκεῖνος (Luke xviii. 14), i. 318.
 ἦλθε (Mark i. 39), i. 178.
 ἡμέρα (Matt. xxiv. 42), i. 155.
 ἡμέτερον (Luke xvi. 12), i. 316.
 ἡμῶν (John xix. 7), ii. 78.
 ἦν (Rom. xiv. 22), ii. 170.
 ἦτε (John viii. 39), ii. 43.
 ἦψατο (Luke viii. 45), what implied by position of, i. 292.

False readings, why, in Revisers' Text, ii. 3; how perpetuated in ancient documents, ii. 219.
 "Farewell" (Acts xxiii. 30), ii. 127.
 Farrar, Archdeacon F. W., D.D., quoted, i. 47.
 "Fathers of the Church," complaints of, i. 17; Latin texts used by, i. 19; African and Western, use of inferior Mss. by, i. 20; an interpretation of, ii. 291; words employed by, ii. 324.
 Ferrar's group of cursive Mss., i. 34; representing a lost uncial, i. 120.

Gamaliel, real utterance and meaning of, ii. 92.
 "Gennesaret," blind use of, i. 106; use of, elsewhere, i. 107, 201.
 "Gergesenes" and kindred names examined, i. 76, 288; testimony of Mss., i. 76.

Gnostics, early corrupters of the text, i. 17.
 Greek text, a form of, unsupported by Mss., i. 88; present state of, of N. T., ii. 7; a fourth-century, of the N. T., ii. 8; errors in, yet to be discovered, ii. 8; the true, of the N. T. in no one ancient document, ii. 9.
 Greek Texts, common name for, i. 15; after the fifth century, i. 16; worst corruptions of, when, i. 17; nature of errors in, i. 22.
 Gregory of Nyssa, misquotation from, noted, i. 256.
 Griesbach, J. J., his leading canon of textual criticism, i. 51; misapplication of, i. 60; readings adopted by, i. 77, 330, ii. 69, 224, 245, 327; use of false text by, ii. 171.
 Γαλιλαίας, as a "Western" reading, examined, i. 270.
 γάρ, omission of, considered, i. 210, 320, ii. 143; position of, considered, i. 279, 325; spurious use of, i. 158, 303, ii. 317; falsely followed by ὅτι, ii. 202; not to be supplanted by δέ, ii. 206.
 γενέσθαι (Acts xxvi. 28), ii. 131.
 γενόμενος (Luke x. 32), i. 300.
 γνωμή (Acts xx. 3), ii. 124.
 Hackett, H. B., D.D., quoted, ii. 108.
 Hamburg, Codex H (Gospels) at, i. 10.
 Hammond, C. E., on Textual Criticism, i. 254; quoted, i. 257.
 Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, a reading of, ii. 311.
 Hearing ears, i. 99.

Hebraisms cited, i. 109, 141, 184, 265, 267, 323, ii. 313.
 Helvidius denies the perpetual virginity of Mary, i. 58.
 Heresies, Irenæus against, i. 17, 18.
 Heretics, work of, in corrupting the text, i. 17.
 Hesychius, the grammarian, cited, i. 358.
 Ἠμοιοτελευταί, defined, i. 9, 22; examples of, i. 27, 352, ii. 113, 144, 158, 179, 207, 208, 281, 300, 313, 314.
 Hort, F. J. A., D.D., later texts, how designated by, i. 16; testimony of, respecting early textual corruptions, i. 17; statement of, considered, i. 17 n.; on the office of textual criticism, i. 46; on early modifications of the Greek text, i. 61; quoted, i. 331, 332, ii. 5, 6, 35, 111, 128, 144, 145, 152, 154, 189, 200, 259, 278, 317; opinion of, noted, i. 154, 242, ii. 244, 317; argument of, for false readings, i. 290, ii. 264.
 Hour of Christ's crucifixion considered, i. 353.
 Hovey, Alvah, D.D., quoted, i. 359.
 Hug on origin of Codex B, i. 9; on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 257.
 Humphry, W. G., B.D., opinion of, on Ms. authority for Matt. i. 25, i. 60; comments of, i. 222, 225, ii. 108, 150, 162, 199, 205, 226.
 Internal evidence, principles of, i. 48.
 Interrogative *versus* indefinite pronoun, ii. 256.
 "In thy name," ii. 75.

Iota subscript, earliest use of, in N. T. Mss., ii. 305.

Irenæus, complaint of, i. 17, 18; differences in texts noted by, i. 17; use of inferior Mss. by, i. 20; a reading defended by, ii. 216; error adopted by, ii. 313.

"Iscariot," a surname of whom? ii. 30.

Itacism, defined, i. 22; illustrated, i. 40, 90, 316, ii. 48, 149, 149 n. 1, 2, 169, 195, 271, 284.

ι, often written ε in the old Mss., ii. 67, 275.

λαθῆτω (Luke vii. 7), i. 74.

Ἰδιᾶ (Acts i. 19), ii. 81.

Ἰδοῦ (James iii. 3), ii. 275.

Ἰδών (Matt. ix. 4), i. 82.

ἰσχυρόν (Matt. xiv. 30), i. 105.

Jerome, complaint of, i. 18; a believer in the perpetual virginity, i. 58; readings adopted by, i. 58, 173, ii. 41; comment of, on Matt. xi. 19, i. 92; an opinion of, i. 172; translations of, noted, i. 256, ii. 189; quoted, i. 277, 358.

John the Evangelist, invariable formula of, ii. 19; use of connectives a peculiarity of, ii. 60; certain uses of language by, noted, ii. 285, 286, 288, 302; *versus* the Revisers' Text, ii. 311, 316.

"Jona" and "John" distinct names, ii. 13.

Joseph, words of the angel to, i. 59; the father of other children of Mary, i. 60.

"Joseph," misapplied by the Revisers, i. 101; and "Josés," distinct names, i. 101.

Josephus, quoted; i. 310, ii. 108.

Judas, objection raised by, ii. 55.

Jude, reading of verse 22 considered, ii. 294.

Justin Martyr, readings from, i. 37, 87, 280.

Kendrick, A. C., D.D., quoted, ii. 40, 55.

καθαρῶν (Mark vii. 19), construction of, i. 204.

καί, Hebraistic use of, i. 30, 109, 184, 203, 265, 267, 301; improper omission of, i. 109, 144, 247, 267, 278, ii. 249; improper retention of, i. 173.

καὶ ἡστέλα, on the omission of (Mark ix. 29), i. 228.

καὶ πῶς (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.

καταβαλλόμενοι, meaning of (Heb. vi. 1), ii. 261.

κατέπεσεν (Luke viii. 6), i. 287.

κατισχύειν, Luke's use of, i. 327.

καύχῃσις, use of, considered, ii. 173.

κάσμου, on the omission of (Matt. xiii. 35), i. 100.

κράζας (Mark ix. 26), i. 228; (Mark xv. 39), i. 252.

κυρίῳ, abbreviated form of, noted, ii. 164.

Lachmann, Carl, adherence to received readings by, i. 37, 38, 91, 92, 103, 127, 152, 188, 198, 216, 220, 233, 262, 270, 277, 284, 287, 313, 316, 322, 327, 329, 330, ii. 17, 18, 20, 37, 44, 46, 54, 59, 66, 69, 77, 80, 81, 165, 179, 206, 207, 237, 245, 266, 270, 306, 321, 324; rejection of received readings by, i. 37, 56, 66, 69, 74, 77, 83, 85,

95, 96, 108, 113 n., 116, 122, 151, 191, 214, 246, 288, 319, ii. 142, 186, 189, 190, 209, 213, 224, 234, 235, 255, 262, 282, 296, 302, 304, 318, 319, 324; inconsistency of, i. 96; false construction by, ii. 180.

Laodiceans, Epistle to the, ii. 212.

Laud, Archbishop William, Codex Laudianus (E Acts) presented by, to Oxford University, i. 10.

Lectionaries, a false reading due to, ii. 171.

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D., adherence of, to certain readings of the Received Text, ii. 206, 207.

Lucian, Presbyter of Alexandria, referred to, i. 18.

Luke, Curetonian Syriac reading of (xxiii. 43), i. 22; misrepresented by scribes, i. 285, ii. 101; prominent thought of, considered, i. 286; style of, illustrated, i. 301, ii. 97; words of, perverted, ii. 83; use of Greek *hy*, ii. 88, 124.

λέγετε, construction of (Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 12), i. 109.

λίθον (Rev. xv. 6), ii. 319.

Macaulay, T. B., error in quoting, noted, ii. 322.

Magdala, how transformed into Magadan, i. 113; parallel cases cited, i. 113 n.

Mai, Cardinal Angelo, extracts by, from the Speculum, ii. 155 n. 1.

Mss., the oldest Greek, a reading found only in, i. 22.

Mss., methods of copyists of, compared, i. 16; later, compared with and corrected by older texts, i.

19; earliest date of, of the Old Latin Version, i. 19; character of, in second century, i. 19; two oldest Greek, i. 19; earliest Greek, not necessarily the best, i. 20; how to use, i. 21, 45; earliest, contain early corruptions, i. 21; additions in early, i. 33; omissions in early, i. 34 (see also "Omissions"); many errors of, from second and third centuries, i. 36; modifications in early, i. 39; substitutions in early, i. 41; more or less vitiated, i. 45; often at variance, i. 45, ii. 155; cause of the preservation of, i. 45; untrustworthiness of early, illustrated, i. 55, 76, 84, 92, 107, 113 and n., 129, 139, 144, 152, 163, 186, 191, 196, 198, 200, 209, 220, 223, 224, 230, 238, 263, 270, 277, 282, 295, 298, 305, 311, 319, 325, 332, 346, 349, 357, 360, ii. 33, 36, 43, 45, 50, 55, 61, 69, 73, 83 n., 87, 107, 110, 113, 119, 122, 128, 145, 147, 149 n. 1 and 2, 158, 169, 175, 180, 186, 190, 194, 200, 211, 215, 218, 222, 225, 227, 234, 236, 240, 244, 249, 255, 258, 263, 265, 267, 272, 275, 278, 282, 289, 301, 309, 313, 314, 319, 322; early collections of, few and costly, i. 61; confusion and variations of, noted, i. 83, 96, ii. 50; Greek, against revised reading noted, i. 88; a reading of the two oldest, noted, i. 88; authority of, insufficient, i. 309, ii. 129; later, disregarded by the Revisers, ii. 5; the earliest, without accents and breathings, ii. 63, 140, 290, 304.

Marginal notes, needless, i. 56, 62, 66, 67, 74, 82, 83, 98, 122, 161, 163, 171, 179, 188, 197, 231, 232, 249, 316, 335, ii. 152, 161, 169, 172, 211, 235; harmful, i. 68; ii. 171; misleading, i. 95, 128, 303, ii. 254; improper, i. 252; omitted by American Revisers, ii. 134.

Marginal reading, unsupported by Greek Mss., i. 56; conflate, i. 188; of John v. 3, 4, considered, ii. 21.

Marginal readings, false, i. 56, 96, 102, 117, 162, 199, 213, 270, 299, 303, 310, ii. 12, 103, 137, 174; genuine, i. 64, 82, 83, 90, 95, 98, 100, 115, 128, 132, 151, 164, 172, 178, 207, 231, 232, 246, 249, 289, 290, 293, 297, 298, 329, 330, 334, 344, ii. 17, 20, 21, 33, 44, 95, 105, 113, 138, 150, 154, 211, 227, 234, 265, 282, 313, 326; emendations, i. 67, 74, 103, 122, 123, 124, 127, 162, 170, 181, 197, 202, 299, 302, 339, ii. 11, 19, 27, 86, 102, 137, 152, 157, 161, 222, 237, 239, 254, 277, 298, 326; probably genuine, i. 72, 110, 203, ii. 127, 196, 260; not internally sustained, i. 314, ii. 194, 246; transcriptional errors, i. 163, 178, 231, 312, 316; ii. 26, 48, 50, 98, 126, 133, 134, 136, 164, 188, 190, 191, 222, 235, 253.

Mark, Gospel of, five Mss. of, well preserved, i. 24 n. 2; readings from, peculiar to Sinaitic Codex, i. 25, 26; readings from, peculiar to Codex A, i. 26; readings from, peculiar to Codex B, i. 27, 28; readings from, peculiar to Codex C, i. 28, 29; chapter vii. of, wanting in Codex C, i. 28; chapter

xvi. of, in full in Codex C, i. 28; readings from, peculiar to Codex D, i. 29; readings from, peculiar to Codex L, i. 30; Curetonian Syriac Version defective in, i. 30; readings from, by various ancient documents, i. 33-44; the evangelist, a Jew, i. 172; in harmony with Matthew, i. 174; xvi. 9-20, testimony in support of, i. 256; misrepresented by copyists, i. 353, 360; apparently not in harmony with John, i. 353, 359; on the hour of the crucifixion, i. 356; xv. 25, true reading of, i. 358; xvi. 2, true reading of, i. 360, 361.

Mary, perpetual virginity of, referred to, i. 58; other children of, i. 59; prophecy concerning, i. 59.

Mary the Magdalene, when at the sepulchre, i. 359.

Matthæi, C. F., a false reading of, ii. 171; a genuine reading adopted by, ii. 265.

Matthew, Gospel of, peculiar readings from, in the Curetonian Syriac Version, i. 30-32; Hebrew Gospel of, ii. 13.

Meyer, H. A. W., opinion of, i. 225, ii. 185; quoted, ii. 122, 152, 167; readings adopted by, ii. 165, 167; cited, ii. 252.

Modena, Codex H (Acts) in Grand Ducal Library, i. 10.

Moscow, Codex K (Epistles) at, i. 10; V (Gospels) at, i. 11.

Moses, improperly quoted, ii. 161.

Munich, Codex X in University Library, i. 11.

Ματθαῖον, i. 112.

μαρτύριον (1 Cor. ii. 1), considered, ii. 178.

μέν, improperly omitted, i. 174.

μή, omission of, considered, ii. 225.

μηδένα, false use of, noted, i. 281.

μοῦ, improper omission of, ii. 41.

Naasenus, misquotation by, i. 72.

Name, my, thy, his, etc., import of, ii. 75.

New Testament, differences between earlier and later Mss. of, considered, i. 16; method of copying Mss. of, i. 16; depravations of, i. 17; copies of, early tampered with, i. 17; date of the worst corruptions of, i. 17, 19; various readings of, referred to, i. 19; views of critics of, i. 20; value of oldest Mss. of, considered, i. 20; as to the genuine text of, i. 21, ii. 7, 9; when readings of Mss. of, may be set aside, i. 21; purpose of the writings of, i. 21; parallel readings of, frequently altered, i. 23; documents generally relied on for the text of, i. 24; character of the ancient documents of, i. 24; an anomalous Greek form in, i. 42; views of early editors of, i. 45; disagreement of oldest Mss. of, i. 45; conflicting use of general principles of criticism by editors of, i. 48; books of, originally separate, i. 61; the canon of, slowly and progressively made, i. 61; source of false readings in, i. 87; Greek, first written in uncials, i. 93.

Nominative absolute, rare use of, ii. 123, 124.

νεκρά (James ii. 20), ii. 273.

νεκροί, Paul's use of, considered, ii. 231.

Omission, examples of, in early Mss., i. 34-39, 58, 61, 64, 65, 68, 81, 85, 90, 98, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150, 151, 153, 156, 164, 168, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178, 180, 187, 188, 202, 203, 207, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 224, 227, 228, 231, 232, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 265, 267, 268, 272, 275, 276, 278, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 297, 298, 301, 306, 307, 308, 312, 313, 317, 321, 322, 328, 330, 334, 337, 345, 349, 351, ii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 33, 38, 39, 41, 49, 51, 52, 59, 60, 62, 76, 78, 81, 85, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 99, 102, 111, 113, 117, 120, 121, 125, 126, 130, 135, 138, 142, 143, 145, 150, 152, 156, 160, 162, 167, 179, 181, 187, 196, 199, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 214, 215, 220, 224, 225, 227, 230, 234, 242, 245, 249, 253, 269, 270, 272, 274, 280, 285, 286, 297, 300, 302, 303, 313, 314, 325, 326.

Origen, complaints of, i. 17, 19; testimony of, i. 79, 88, 100, 101, 246, ii. 54; quoted, i. 340, ii. 118; misquotation from, noted, ii. 11 n.; rendering of a Hebrew verb by, ii. 106.

Orosius, quoted, i. 285.

Oxford, Codex E (Acts) presented to University of, by Abp. Laud, i. 10; Codex F in part, and Co-

dex A, in Bodleian Library at, i. 11.
 δ βαπτίζων without καί (Mark i. 4), the true reading, i. 21, 173.
 δ γεννηθεῖς, unwarranted use of, ii. 292.
 δ Θεός, improperly set aside, ii. 166.
 οἱ ἄνθρωποι (Luke ii. 15), why omitted, i. 265.
 οἱ δοῦλοι, improper omission of, i. 307.
 δ κύριος, improper omission of, i. 170, ii. 272.
 διτιγοπιστίαν, improper use of, considered, i. 120.
 δλον, Matthew's use of, i. 135.
 δ . . . μείζον (John x. 29), ii. 50.
 δ μονογενής, use of, referred to, ii. 292.
 ὁμοῦ (Acts ii. 1), ii. 82.
 δρος (Luke xiv. 5), i. 310.
 ἐργιζόμενος, meaning of, examined, i. 64.
 δρεῖ (Heb. xii. 18), ii. 269.
 δς (Eph. i. 14), ii. 213; (Col. i. 27), ii. 223; (1 Tim. iii. 16), ii. 240; (Rev. xiii. 14), ii. 303.
 δτι, as a sign of quotation, ii. 202; (1 Tim. vi. 7), ii. 244.
 οὐ (Acts v. 28), ii. 89; (Rom. iv. 19), ii. 145; (Phil. iii. 13), ii. 219.
 οὐκέτι (Luke xxii. 16), i. 328.
 οὐν, ii. 51, 59.
 οὐπω (John vii. 8), ii. 33; (Phil. iii. 13), ii. 219.
 δ Χριστός (John vii. 42), ii. 37.
 ὦ (Rom. xvi. 27), ii. 174; (1 Pet. iii. 21), ii. 278.
 ὦδε (Matt. xxvi. 53), i. 160; (Mark ix. 1), i. 219; (Luke xv. 17), i. 314; (1 Cor. iv. 2), ii. 180.

ὡς (Acts xvii. 14), significance of, ii. 117.
 ὡσεῖ, Luke's use of, ii. 97.

Paris, National Library of, Codices C and D (Epistles) in, i. 9; Codices K (Gospels), L (Gospels), M (Gospels) in, i. 10.

Patristic writings, early date of, i. 17.
 Paul, occupation of, ii. 118; use of language by, ii. 140, 163, 164, 173, 202, 210, 212, 241, 244, 249; style of, ii. 168, 170, 177; not illogical, ii. 166, 204; *versus* copyists and Revisers' readings, ii. 148, 212, 215, 218.

Peshito Syriac Version, resemblance of, in peculiar readings, to oldest Mss., i. 19; one of a few witnesses to a genuine reading, i. 22; glosses frequent in, ii. 166.

Philippi, a place of prayer near, ii. 115.

Pilate, use of "righteous" by, i. 162; question of, i. 251; Christ brought before, i. 355; Christ delivered by, to be crucified, when, i. 356.

Proper names, spelling of, i. 51, 75, 112.

Psalms i. and ii., reference to, ii. 107.

πάλιν (Mark xi. 3), i. 239; (Heb. vi. 1), ii. 261.

πάντα (Luke xiv. 17), i. 312.

πᾶς (Luke xvi. 18), i. 317.

πλοῖον, without the article (Matt. xiv. 22), i. 104.

ποιεῖν, used to save repetition of other verbs, i. 199, ii. 131.

ποιεῖτε (Matt. xxi. 13), insufficiently attested, i. 137.

ποιῆσαι (Acts xxvi. 28), a genuine reading, ii. 130.

ποιήσωμεν (Matt. xvii. 4), i. 118.

πολύ (John v. 3), ii. 21.

πρός interchanged with εἰς, i. 85.

πρώτον, omission of (Matt. xvii. 11), i. 119.

πτῶμα (Matt. xiv. 12), i. 102; for σῶμα (Mark xv. 45), i. 253.

πῶς (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.

φράσον (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.

φωνή, use of (Rev. vi. 1), ii. 304.

φωνῆς (Matt. xxiv. 31), i. 151.

Reading, a form of, unsupported by Ms. authority, i. 88; original, probably lost, i. 159, 200, 223, 319, ii. 244; true, of Mark ix. 12 considered, i. 222; probably genuine, supported by a single Greek Ms., ii. 110, 260, 315.

Readings, peculiar to single documents, value of, i. 32; evidence respecting, to be duly weighed, i. 53; conflate, defined and illustrated, i. 171, 175, 188, ii. 87, 222; Revisers', adopted by vote, ii. 3; preference given by the Revisers to, of oldest Mss., ii. 4; "Alexandrian," "Syrian," "Western," ii. 5; various, in Rev. xv. 3, noted, ii. 318.

Relative, Greek, questionable form of, i. 96; uses of, noted, i. 125, ii. 74, 213, 223; questionable uses of, ii. 74, 77, 170, 175.

Rendering of Hebrew verb (Deut. i. 31), cited, ii. 106.

Revised Version, Preface of, quoted from, i. 63, 242, ii. 16.

Revisers, inconsistency of, i. 38, 96,

ii. 14, 63, 121, 123, 127, 135, 140, 186, 306, 307, 323; incorrect renderings of, i. 55, 106, 143, 201, 204, 237, 262, 304, 320, 340, 343, 349, ii. 41, 42, 47, 78, 84, 88, 121, 126, 127, 145, 153, 186, 194, 219, 225, 227, 241, 269, 276, 299, 300, 304, 316, 323; not textual critics, ii. 3; failure of, to make a needed correction, ii. 71.

Revisers' Greek Text, defined, i. 15; plea in behalf of alterations found in, i. 15; unwarranted omissions in, i. 34, 97, 156, 168, 227, 244, 253, 330, ii. 28, 38, 62, 92, 111, 113, 162, 304; inconsistent with English version, i. 37, 143, 238, 343, ii. 82 n. 2, 316; not identical with Westcott and Hort's, i. 48; needless changes in, i. 55, 63, 83, 85, 97, 126, 133, 140, 141, 159, 247, 265, 274, 280, 286, 288, 289, 307, 332, 341, ii. 16, 17, 37, 63, 65, 80, 130, 135, 140, 151, 186, 192, 202, 206, 223, 230, 231, 253, 268, 272, 274, 299, 307, 323; false or questionable readings of, considered, i. 84, 86, 109, 143, 153, 157, 171, 182, 184, 186, 189, 195, 198, 199, 216, 219, 224, 228, 234, 237, 240, 242, 249, 251, 262, 266, 267, 276, 281, 284, 285, 294, 304, 325, 340, 348, 349, 360, ii. 46, 53, 57, 64, 73, 76, 82, 86, 101, 162, 228, 243, 257, 263, 266, 299, 307, 311, 316, 319, 321, 325; anti-Johannean readings of, ii. 15, 79, 284, 285, 288; false construction in, ii. 84; omission of Acts viii. 37 and xv. 34 in, considered, ii. 95, 113; readings of, supported

- by a single Greek Ms., ii. 115, 300, 303, 313, 314; reading of Rev. xiii. 1 and 10 in, considered, ii. 311, 314.
- Riddle, M. B., D.D., quoted, i. 242.
- Roberts, Alexander, D.D., on similarities and diversities of readings in the Gospels, i. 73; opinion of, i. 225, 226; answered by Dean Burgon, i. 256; quoted, ii. 258.
- Rome, Codices L (Acts and Epistles), N in part, S (Gospels), and T, at, i. 10; Codices T^a and Y at, i. 11; Christians of, referred to, ii. 165.
- Rossano, Codex Σ in Archbishop's Library at, i. 11.
- ῥήματος, a Hebraistic use of, i. 323.
- ῥύεται (2 Cor. i. 10), ii. 192.
- Sabbath, words spoken with reference to, i. 310, ii. 46.
- Sceva, sons of, worsted, ii. 123.
- Schaefer, critical note by, i. 192 n.
- Schaff, Philip, D.D., opinion of, i. 225.
- Scott, Thomas, quoted, i. 356.
- Scrivener, F. H. A., LL.D., account of uncial Mss. from, i. 9; testimony of, concerning early documents, i. 19; on the doxology in the Lord's prayer, i. 69; on τέκνων (Matt. xi. 19), i. 93; on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, i. 242, 263, 291, ii. 12, 39, 40, 289 n.
- Severus on Mark xvi. 9-20, only a copyist, i. 256.
- Septuagint, rendering of Isa. xiv. 15, in, i. 95; results of copyist's familiarity with, i. 141, ii. 59, 311; cited, ii. 83 n., 94, 106, 161, 320.
- Shakespeare, a misprint from Ms. of, noted, i. 49, ii. 244.
- "Sidon," omission of (Mark vii. 24), i. 207; construction of, in Mark vii. 31, i. 208.
- Silas at Antioch, ii. 113.
- "Son of God" (Mark i. 1), i. 171.
- "Son of John," ii. 12.
- "Spirit," reference of (John vi. 63), ii. 155 n. 2.
- Statements designed to prepare the way for subsequent statements, ii. 24.
- Stephen, Robert, referred to, i. 20.
- St. Gall, Switzerland, Codex Δ in monastery of, i. 11.
- St. Petersburg, Codex Ⲭ at, i. 9; Codices E (Epistles), H (Epistles) in part, I, and P (Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse) at, i. 10; Codices T^b, T^c, Γ in part, Θ, II, at, i. 11.
- "Strain at" (Matt. xxiii. 24), an illustration of perpetuated blunders, ii. 219, 244.
- Tunica, reference to Mss. used by, i. 20.
- Symbols, errors from mistaking, i. 356, 357, ii. 26.
- Syriac Version, Curetonian, character of, i. 20.
- Syrian Church, use of inferior Mss. by, i. 20.
- "Syrian readings," examples of, i. 86, 91, 173, 351, ii. 166, 210.
- στιβάδας, κόψαντες (Mark xi. 8), i. 240.
- συνέλαβον, meaning of, considered, i. 274.

- συνήθεια, Paul's use of, ii. 183.
- συστρεφόμενων (Matt. xvii. 22), i. 122.
- σῶμα (Matt. xxvii. 58), i. 168.
- Tatian, given to abridging, i. 165; *Diatessaron* of, referred to, i. 164, 173.
- "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," date of, i. 68; testimony of, for the doxology, i. 68.
- Tenses, changes of, noted, i. 118, 137, 190, 261, ii. 72, 93; improper use of, noted, i. 149, 159, 189, 218, 233, 238, 283, 289, 332, 341, 361, ii. 42, 48, 55, 57, 58, 91, 126, 127, 181, 183, 192, 197, 232, 235, 239, 306, 309, 323.
- Tertullian, *memoriter* quotation by, i. 37.
- Texts, the "best," ii. 6.
- Textual criticism, Bengel canon of, cited and illustrated, i. 48; Griesbach's canon of, cited and illustrated, i. 51; calls for two classes of evidence, i. 53; science of, supposed by some to be matured, ii. 7; presents a field of future labor, ii. 9; principles of, carried to extremes, ii. 316.
- Textual critics, work of, when needed, i. 46; considerations not to be overlooked by, i. 47; agree on general principles, but differ on their application, i. 47; necessary qualifications of, of the N. T., i. 52; infatuation of some, ii. 236, 317.
- Textus Receptus*, defined, i. 15; Stephen's work on, referred to, i. 20; omission of "neither the Son," from Matt. xxiv. 36 in, considered, i. 152; an important omission from Matt. xxvii. 49 in, considered, i. 164.
- Thayer's Grimm's Lexicon, referred to, i. 243 n., ii. 226.
- Theophylact, opinion of, i. 78.
- Thomson, W. M., D.D., quoted, i. 79.
- Thucydides, cited, ii. 117.
- Tichonius the Donatist, testimony of, on Mark xvi. 2, i. 360.
- Time, John's mode of reckoning, i. 354; compared with that of the other evangelists, i. 354.
- Tischendorf, Constantine, account of Mss. from, i. 9; opinion of, concerning Codex D (Epistles), i. 9; citations of, from Codex R, i. 10; certain erroneous readings adopted by, i. 26, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44; reason of, for omitting certain words, i. 36, ii. 270; adherence to received readings by, i. 37, 83, 85, 95, 97, 103, 108, 116, 151, 154, 188, 214, 216, 262, 270, 277, 313, 329, ii. 17, 18, 38, 44, 54, 59, 68, 80, 81, 90, 132, 179, 206, 207, 213, 224, 251, 256, 257, 264, 266, 302, 306, 310, 312, 319, 321, 323; rejection of received readings by, i. 56, 66, 69, 76, 84, 90, 91, 92, 96, 103, 113 n., 123, 127, 147, 151, 178, 182, 186, 187, 188, 191, 195, 197, 210, 216, 220, 231, 232, 234, 245, 246, 284, 288, 293, 307, 318, 322, 326, 344, 351, ii. 20, 28, 29, 47, 69, 93, 94, 141, 142, 165, 189, 190, 209, 228, 237, 245, 247, 270, 282, 296, 304, 318, 325, 326; er-

roneous citation by, i. 56 n.; adoption of a *verbosior lectio* by, i. 85; inconsistency of, i. 234; opinion of, i. 242; quoted, ii. 38, 245, 246; genuine reading adopted by, ii. 299.

"Titus" (Acts xviii. 7), a false reading, ii. 119.

Transcribers, mistakes of, i. 16, 22, ii. 311.

Tregelles, S. P., LL.D., rejection of received readings by, i. 56, 69, 76, 90, 96, 103, 108, 113 n., 122, 191, 214, 220, 277, 288, 322, 326, ii. 17, 46, 69, 141, 190, 206, 282, 314, 318; adherence to received readings by, i. 91, 116, 127, 151, 152, 188, 216, 233, 270, 329, 330, ii. 18, 20, 44, 142, 165, 179, 207, 213, 224, 245, 266, 270, 306, 321, 324.

Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24), i. 207.

θέλῃ (Rev. xi. 5), ii. 306.

θεμέλιον (Heb. vi. 1), reference of, ii. 261.

Θεός, omission of (Matt. xxii. 32), i. 145.

Θεοῦ, omission of (John v. 44), ii. 26.

τὰ δίκτυα, reading of, considered, i. 35.

ταῦτα, overlooked by copyists, i. 265; use of, in Luke xxiv. 11, i. 346; for ταῦτά, i. 279, 280.

ταύτην, omission of (Matt. xv. 15), i. 112.

τέκνων, mistaken for τεχνῶν (Matt. xi. 19), i. 91.

τῆς, improperly read for τῆς (Rom. viii. 24), ii. 156.

τὸ, introducing an indirect interrogative clause, i. 225 and n. 4.

τὸ ἱερὸν (Matt. xxi. 12), i. 137.

τολμῶ, ii. 174 n.

τὸ δνομα (Rev. xiii. 8), ii. 313.

τὸ πνεῦμα (Mark i. 26), omitted only in B, i. 35.

τοῦτον, omission of (1 Cor. iii. 12), ii. 179.

τοῦ τυφλοῦ (John ix. 6), ii. 48.

τυπικῶς (1 Cor. x. 11), ii. 187.

τῶν ἔργων (James ii. 26), ii. 274.

Uncial Mss., described, i. 9.

Utrecht, Codex F (Gospels) in Public Library of, i. 10.

υἱός for δνος, i. 310; meaning a disciple, ii. 13.

ὕμῳ, omission of, noted, ii. 41.

ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου, a probably lost reading, i. 319.

ὕπὸ for ἐπὶ, i. 30, 95 n., 211.

Vatican Codex, certain readings peculiar to, i. 27, 28.

Venice, Codex U in Library of St. Mark's, i. 11.

Versions, oldest, referred to, i. 17; connection between Codex D and the Old Latin and Curetonian Syriac, i. 19; agreement among, an argument for a reading, i. 60, 62, 65, 69, 83, 90, 102, 105, 163, 178, 188, 190, 202, 204, 208, 229, 239, 241, 253, 268, 274, 287, 315, 343, ii. 11, 16, 57, 58, 69, 138, 169, 170, 194, 209, 220, 221, 233, 242, 245, 246, 254, 276.

Victor of Antioch on Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 256.

Vienna, two leaves of Codex N at, i. 10.

Vulgate, quoted from, ii. 289.

Weiss, Bernhard, D.D., testimony of, concerning early textual corruptions, i. 18; quoted, i. 18, 22.

Westcott, Canon B. F., D.D., opinion of, concerning Codex 102 (Gospels), i. 35; *versus* Hort, ii. 244, 264.

Westcott and Hort, adherence to one Ms., i. 16; their reading of Mark i. 4, i. 21; certain additions to the text by, i. 33, 34; certain omissions from the text by, i. 36, 37, 38, 39, 66, 291, 293; certain modifications adopted by, i. 40, 41; a few readings substituted by, for those of the *Textus Receptus*, i. 41, 42, 43, 44; false reading of Matt. viii. 10 adopted by, i. 74; their estimate of the two oldest Greek Mss., i. 95 n.,

154, ii. 5, 6; consistency of, i. 96; their manner of writing the contracted reflexive, ii. 63, 289, 290, 323; reject the testimony of **Σ**, B in Acts vii. 7, ii. 93; quoted, ii. 104, 111, 244; adhere to received reading in Rom. xiv. 19, ii. 169.

Wetstein, J. J., Codex F (Gospels) collated by, i. 10.

Winer, Geo. B., D.D., cited, i. 192 n., 288 n., ii. 112.

Wolfenbüttel, Codices P (Gospels) and Q in Ducal Library of, i. 10.

Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher, quoted, ii. 188.

Xenophon, Anabasis of, referred to, i. 279; cited, ii. 143 n.

Χριστός (Matt. xvi. 21), i. 117.

Ψ, or Codex *Athous Laura*, reference to, i. 39.

II. INDEX OF CITATIONS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[Figures without any accompanying mark or letter denote passages or readings from the Text proper, more or less fully examined. Those with an asterisk (*) denote marginal readings noticed. Those with an obelisk (†), passages only briefly noted. Those followed by n., passages cited or noticed in footnotes.]

MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.
i. 5, 7, 8, 10.....i. 113 n.	ix. 32.....i. 85	xiv. 34.....i. 106
i. 7, 8, 10.....i. 55*	x. 11.....i. 236†	xv. 4.....i. 108
i. 18.....i. 56*	xi. 2.....i. 86	xv. 6.....i. 109, 110*
i. 25.....i. 58	xi. 9.....i. 88	xv. 14.....i. 111
ii. 6.....ii. 305†	xi. 15.....i. 90*	xv. 15.....i. 112
iv. 24.....i. 61	xi. 16.....i. 90†	xv. 39.....i. 22†, 112
v. 4.....i. 62*	xi. 19.....i. 60†, 91	xvi. 2, 3.....i. 115*
v. 13.....i. 63	xi. 23.....i. 93, 95*	xvi. 8.....i. 115
v. 22.....i. 64*	xii. 4.....i. 96*	xvi. 13.....i. 116
v. 25.....i. 66*	xii. 31.....i. 96*	xvi. 21.....i. 117*
v. 30.....i. 66	xii. 46.....i. 59†, 97	xvii. 4.....i. 118
v. 37.....i. 67*	xii. 47.....i. 98*	xvii. 11.....i. 119
vi. 8.....i. 67*	xiii. 9.....i. 98	xvii. 20.....i. 120
vi. 13.....i. 68	xiii. 16.....i. 144†	xvii. 21.....i. 121
vi. 34.....ii. 289†	xiii. 18.....ii. 128†	xvii. 22.....i. 122*
vii. 13.....i. 72*	xiii. 35.....i. 100*	xviii. 11.....i. 123
viii. 9.....i. 72*	xiii. 36.....i. 100	xviii. 14.....i. 123*
viii. 10.....i. 74*	xiii. 43.....i. 99*, 101	xviii. 15.....i. 124*
viii. 23.....i. 75	xiii. 55.....i. 101	xviii. 28.....i. 125
viii. 28.....i. 75, 113 n.	xiii. 55, 56.....i. 59†	xix. 3.....i. 126
viii. 29.....i. 81	xiv. 12.....i. 102	xix. 9.....i. 127*
ix. 4.....i. 82*	xiv. 24.....i. 102*	xix. 10.....i. 127
ix. 14.....i. 83*	xiv. 29.....i. 103*	xix. 16, 17.....i. 128*
ix. 18.....i. 83	xiv. 30.....i. 104	xix. 20.....i. 132

MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.	MARK.
xix. 29.....i. 132*	xxviii. 6.....i. 170*	v. 2.....i. 36†
xx. 15.....i. 133		v. 27.....i. 194
xx. 16.....i. 134	MARK.	v. 36.....i. 195
xxi. 4.....i. 135	i. 1.....i. 171*	vi. 2.....i. 197*
xxi. 6.....i. 136	i. 2.....i. 171*	vi. 14.....i. 40†, 197*
xxi. 7.....i. 136†	i. 4.....i. 21, 173	vi. 20.....i. 198
xxi. 12.....i. 137*	i. 8.....i. 174	vi. 22.....i. 199*
xxi. 13.....i. 137	i. 13.....i. 175	vi. 27, 28.....i. 36†
xxi. 15.....i. 138	i. 14.....i. 176	vi. 29, 56.....i. 42†
xxi. 44.....i. 140*	i. 16.....i. 34, 41	vi. 33.....i. 199
xxi. 46.....i. 140	i. 19, 21.....i. 35†	vi. 35.....i. 40†
xxii. 1.....i. 141	i. 23.....i. 177	vi. 53.....i. 201
xxii. 5.....i. 141†	i. 28.....i. 272†	vii. 4.....i. 201*, 202
xxii. 13.....i. 142	i. 39.....i. 178	vii. 12. { i. 109†, 110†,
xxii. 23.....i. 143	i. 40.....i. 178	203
xxii. 27.....i. 144	i. 45.....i. 35†, 41†	vii. 16.....i. 203*
xxii. 30.....i. 145	ii. 1.....i. 179	vii. 19.....i. 22†, 204
xxii. 32.....i. 145	ii. 2.....i. 180	vii. 24.....i. 207*
xxiii. 4.....i. 147*	ii. 3.....i. 180	vii. 28.....i. 210
xxiii. 14.....i. 148	ii. 4.....i. 35†, 41†, 181*	vii. 30.....i. 210
xxiii. 17.....i. 149	ii. 8.....i. 35†	vii. 31.....i. 208†, 212
xxiii. 19.....i. 150	ii. 12.....i. 182	vii. 35.....i. 33†, 212
xxiii. 35.....i. 152 n.	ii. 15.....i. 184	vii. 37.....i. 213
xxiii. 38.....i. 151*, 309†	ii. 16.....i. 184	viii. 3.....i. 42†
xxiv. 31.....i. 151*	ii. 22.....i. 186	viii. 6.....i. 360
xxiv. 36.....i. 152	ii. 26.....i. 36†	viii. 7.....i. 26†
xxiv. 38.....i. 153	iii. 1.....i. 36†	viii. 10.....i. 112†
xxiv. 42.....i. 155	iii. 14, 16.....i. 188*	viii. 15.....i. 361
xxiv. 48.....i. 156	iii. 15.....i. 188	viii. 16.....i. 213*
xxv. 2.....i. 157	iii. 21.....i. 42†	viii. 17.....i. 214
xxvi. 26.....i. 159	iii. 25.....i. 189	viii. 20.....i. 215
xxvi. 53.....i. 160	iii. 26.....i. 190	viii. 22.....i. 42†
xxvi. 69.....i. 272†	iii. 28.....i. 144†	viii. 23.....i. 215, 236†
xxvii. 4.....i. 161*	iii. 29.....i. 190	viii. 26.....i. 216
xxvii. 5.....i. 161	iii. 30.....i. 207†	viii. 37.....i. 218
xxvii. 24.....i. 162*	iii. 32.....i. 33†	ix. 1.....i. 219
xxvii. 28.....i. 162*	iv. 1.....i. 33†	ix. 11.....i. 221
xxvii. 49.....i. 164*	iv. 10.....i. 193, 236†	ix. 12, 13.....i. 222
xxvii. 58.....i. 168	iv. 16.....i. 27†, 144†	ix. 14.....i. 40†
xxviii. 2.....i. 169	iv. 21.....i. 95 n.	ix. 23.....i. 224

MARK.	MARK.	LUKE.	LUKE.	JOHN.	JOHN.
ix. 24.....i. 227	xv. 44.....i. 236†	viii. 35.....i. 289	xix. 29, 30.....i. 321	i. 42.....i. 114 n., ii. 12	xi. 44.....ii. 52
ix. 26.....i. 228	xv. 45.....i. 28†, 253	viii. 43.....i. 289*	xx. 14.....i. 321	i. 49.....ii. 14	xi. 45.....ii. 52
ix. 29.....i. 228	xvi. 2.....i. 359	viii. 45.....i. 290*, 291	xx. 23.....i. 322	i. 51.....ii. 14	xi. 53.....ii. 53
ix. 40.....i. 229	xvi. 9-20.....i. 39†, 253	ix. 2.....i. 293*	xx. 26.....i. 323	ii. 11.....ii. 15	xi. 54.....ii. 54
x. 7.....i. 231*		ix. 10.....i. 51†, 293	xxi. 6.....i. 324	ii. 12.....ii. 16	xii. 7.....ii. 54
x. 24.....i. 232*	LUKE.	ix. 35.....i. 296	xxi. 34, 35.....i. 325	ii. 15.....ii. 17	xii. 23.....ii. 57
x. 26.....i. 43†	i. 26.....i. 272†	ix. 50.....i. 229	xxi. 36.....i. 326, <i>bis</i>	iii. 13.....ii. 17*	xii. 25.....ii. 57
x. 36.....i. 41†	i. 78.....i. 261	ix. 54.....i. 297*	xxii. 16.....i. 328	iii. 16.....ii. 18	xiii. 2.....ii. 31†
x. 43.....i. 233	i. 14.....i. 262	ix. 55.....i. 298	xxii. 19, 20.....i. 329*	iii. 17.....ii. 19	xiii. 18.....ii. 59
x. 49.....i. 234	ii. 15.....i. 265	ix. 56.....i. 299†	xxii. 31.....i. 330	iii. 31.....ii. 19*	xiii. 22.....ii. 59
xi. 3.....i. 237	ii. 51.....i. 265	x. 1, 17.....i. 299*	xxii. 43, 44.....i. 330	iv. 6.....i. 354†	xiii. 23.....ii. 60
xi. 8.....i. 240	iii. 17.....i. 266	x. 15.....i. 93†, 95†, 299	xxiii. 19.....i. 332	iv. 9.....ii. 20*	xiii. 24.....ii. 60
xi. 22, 23.....i. 43†	iii. 20.....i. 267	x. 21.....i. 300	xxiii. 26.....i. 334†	iv. 47.....i. 272†	xiii. 26.....ii. 31†
xii. 4.....i. 241	iv. 1.....i. 267	x. 30.....i. 301†	xxiii. 29.....i. 144†	iv. 52.....i. 354†	xiii. 32.....ii. 62, 63
xii. 9, 17, 26, }.....i. 37†	iv. 4.....i. 268	x. 32.....i. 300	xxiii. 32.....i. 335†	v. 3.....ii. 21	xiv. 4, 5.....ii. 64
27, 30, 34 }.....i. 37†	iv. 17.....i. 269	x. 38.....i. 301	xxiii. 33.....i. 333	v. 3, 4.....ii. 21	xiv. 7.....ii. 65
xii. 21.....i. 243	iv. 44.....i. 114 n, 270*	x. 41, 42.....i. 302*	xxiii. 34.....i. 332†, 334*	v. 44.....ii. 26*	xiv. 14.....ii. 66
xii. 36.....i. 144†	v. 1.....i. 272	xi. 11.....i. 303*	xxiii. 35.....i. 335	vi. 14.....ii. 27*	xiv. 22.....ii. 31†
xiii. 6, 7, 9, 22, 23.....i. 38†	v. 5.....i. 273	xi. 34.....i. 304	xxiii. 38.....i. 337	vi. 37, 39.....ii. 74†	xv. 11.....ii. 67
xiii. 8.....i. 244	v. 9.....i. 274	xii. 25.....i. 306	xxiii. 42.....i. 339*	vi. 47.....ii. 27	xvi. 4.....ii. 68
xiii. 11.....i. 244	v. 17.....i. 274	xii. 38.....i. 307	xxiii. 43.....i. 32†	vi. 51.....ii. 28	xvi. 23.....ii. 69
xiii. 22.....i. 245	v. 33.....i. 275	xiii. 25.....i. 308†	xxiii. 45.....i. 340	vi. 63.....ii. 155 n. 2†	xvii. 2.....ii. 74†
xiii. 27.....i. 246	vi. 1.....i. 152 n., 276	xiii. 27.....i. 308	xxiii. 47.....i. 341	vi. 71.....ii. 30	xvii. 3.....ii. 71
xiii. 33.....i. 246*	vi. 6.....i. 278	xiii. 35.....i. 308	xxiii. 49.....i. 343	vii. 3.....i. 272†	xvii. 4.....ii. 72
xiv. 2.....i. 43†	vi. 23.....i. 279	xiv. 5.....i. 310*	xxiv. 3, 6, 9.....i. 344*	vii. 8.....ii. 33*	xvii. 6, 9.....ii. 74†
xiv. 3.....i. 247	vi. 26.....i. 279†	xiv. 17.....i. 312	xxiv. 10.....i. 345	vii. 42.....ii. 37	xvii. 11, 12.....ii. 73
xiv. 5, 30, 31.....i. 38†	vi. 34.....i. 280	xv. 16.....i. 313	xxiv. 11.....i. 346	vii. 46.....ii. 38	xvii. 21.....ii. 76
xiv. 18.....i. 41†	vi. 35.....i. 281*	xv. 17.....i. 313	xxiv. 12.....i. 344*	vii. 53-viii. 11.....ii. 39*	xvii. 24.....ii. 77
xiv. 51.....i. 247	vi. 48.....i. 281	xv. 21.....i. 314	xxiv. 17.....i. 348	viii. 38.....ii. 41	xviii. 9.....ii. 74†
xiv. 52.....i. 248	vii. 7.....i. 74†	xv. 24.....i. 315†	xxiv. 21.....i. 349	viii. 39.....ii. 42	xviii. 40.....i. 114 n.
xiv. 68.....i. 249*	vii. 9.....i. 74†	xv. 32.....i. 315	xxiv. 27.....i. 342†	viii. 44.....ii. 44*	xix. 7.....ii. 78
xiv. 72.....i. 249	vii. 11.....i. 283	xvi. 12.....i. 316*	xxiv. 36, 40.....i. 344*	ix. 4.....ii. 46	xix. 14.....i. 353, 354
xv. 1.....i. 44†	vii. 32.....i. 284	xvi. 18.....i. 317	xxiv. 47.....i. 207†, 351*	ix. 6.....ii. 47	xix. 31-37.....i. 166†
xv. 4, 20, 36.....i. 39†	vii. 33.....i. 285	xvii. 3.....i. 317	xxiv. 51, 52.....i. 344*	ix. 15.....i. 237†	xix. 34.....i. 165†
xv. 6.....i. 44†, 159†	viii. 3.....i. 285	xvii. 6.....ii. 44†	xxiv. 53.....i. 351	x. 18.....ii. 48*	xx. 1.....i. 359
xv. 8.....i. 250	viii. 6.....i. 286	xvii. 30.....i. 280†		x. 22.....ii. 49*, 49	xx. 18.....i. 237†, ii. 79
xv. 12.....i. 251	viii. 9.....i. 237†	xviii. 14.....i. 318		x. 25.....i. 190†	xxi. 15, 16, 17.....ii. 13†
xv. 25.....i. 44†, 353	viii. 12.....i. 287	xix. 18.....i. 320	JOHN.	x. 29.....ii. 50*	xxi. 23.....ii. 80
xv. 34.....i. 27†	viii. 26, 37.....i. 288	xix. 20.....i. 320	i. 15.....ii. 11*	x. 39.....ii. 51	
xv. 39.....i. 251	viii. 27.....i. 288	xix. 26.....i. 320	i. 18.....ii. 12*	xi. 9.....i. 354†	
			i. 39.....i. 354†		

ACTS.	ACTS.	ROMANS.
i. 19.....ii. 81	xvi. 13.....ii. 114	iv. 17.....ii. 231 n.
ii. 1.....ii. 81	xvii. 3.....ii. 115	iv. 19.....ii. 145
ii. 47.....ii. 84	xvii. 14.....ii. 116	v. 1.....ii. 147
iii. 6.....ii. 85	xvii. 26.....ii. 117	v. 2.....ii. 150*
iii. 10.....i. 308†	xvii. 28.....i. 279†	v. 6.....ii. 151
iv. 1.....ii. 86*	xviii. 3.....ii. 118	v. 17.....ii. 152*
iv. 12.....i. 264†	xviii. 7.....ii. 119	vii. 23.....ii. 153
iv. 25.....ii. 87	xviii. 7, 24...i. 114 n.	viii. 2.....ii. 154†
v. 16.....ii. 88	xviii. 21.....ii. 120	viii. 11.....ii. 154*
v. 28.....ii. 89	xix. 14.....ii. 121	viii. 24.....ii. 156
v. 33.....ii. 90	xix. 16.....ii. 121	viii. 35.....ii. 157*
v. 39.....ii. 91	xix. 34.....ii. 123	viii. 38.....ii. 158
vi. 13.....ii. 92	xx. 3.....ii. 124	x. 3.....ii. 160
vii. 7.....ii. 93	xx. 5.....ii. 124	x. 5.....ii. 160
vii. 11.....ii. 94†	xx. 5.....ii. 125*	x. 9.....ii. 161*
vii. 36.....ii. 93	xxi. 22.....ii. 125	xi. 17.....ii. 162
viii. 18.....ii. 95*	xxi. 24.....ii. 126	xii. 11.....ii. 164
viii. 32.....ii. 129†	xxiii. 5.....ii. 202†	xiii. 11.....ii. 165
viii. 37.....ii. 95	xxiii. 28.....ii. 126*	xiv. 4.....ii. 166
ix. 25.....ii. 96	xxiii. 30.....ii. 127*	xiv. 6.....ii. 167
x. 3.....ii. 96	xxiii. 34.....i. 237†	xiv. 19.....ii. 169*
x. 11.....ii. 98	xxv. 13.....ii. 127	xiv. 22.....ii. 169
x. 20.....ii. 100†	xxvi. 16.i. 279†, ii. 129	xiv. 23.....ii. 171*
x. 24.....i. 22†, ii. 98*	xxvi. 20.....ii. 130	xv. 15.....ii. 172
x. 30.....ii. 99	xxvi. 28.....ii. 130	xv. 17.....ii. 172
xi. 12.....ii. 100	xxvii. 16.....ii. 131	xv. 27.....ii. 141†
xi. 21.....ii. 101	xxvii. 19.....ii. 132	xvi. 27.....ii. 174
xi. 22.....ii. 102	xxvii. 37.....ii. 133*	
xi. 23.....ii. 102*	xxvii. 39.....ii. 134*	
xii. 5.....ii. 103	xxvii. 41.....ii. 135	
xii. 25.....ii. 103*	xxviii. 1.....{ i. 114 n., ii. 136*	
xiii. 17.....ii. 94†	xxviii. 13.....ii. 137*	
xiii. 18.....ii. 105*	xxviii. 16.....ii. 138*	
xiii. 19, 20.....ii. 107		
xiii. 25.....ii. 109		
xiii. 33.....ii. 110		
xiv. 27.....i. 361†		
xv. 24.....ii. 111		
xv. 34.....ii. 113		
xvi. 3.....i. 308†		

ROMANS.

i. 24.....ii. 140
ii. 14.....ii. 140
iii. 2.....ii. 142
iii. 22.....ii. 143

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 15.....ii. 177
ii. 1.....ii. 178
iii. 12.....ii. 179
iv. 2.....ii. 180
vii. 37, 38.....ii. 181
viii. 4.....ii. 181
viii. 7.....ii. 182
viii. 8.....ii. 183
ix. 15.....ii. 185
x. 6.....ii. 141†
x. 11.....ii. 186

1 CORINTHIANS.

xii. 9.....ii. 188
xiii. 3.....ii. 188*
xiv. 15.....ii. 149 n. I
xiv. 38.....ii. 189*
xv. 14.....ii. 190*
xv. 15, 20.....ii. 232†
xv. 29, 35, 42, 52. ii. 231 n.
xv. 49.....ii. 190*

2 CORINTHIANS.

i. 1.....ii. 192
i. 9.....ii. 231 n.
i. 10.....ii. 192
iii. 3.....ii. 194
iii. 9.....ii. 194*
iv. 6.....ii. 195
iv. 14.....ii. 196*
v. 17.....ii. 196
xi. 4.....ii. 197
xi. 6.....ii. 198
xi. 32.....ii. 199
xii. 7.....ii. 200

GALATIANS.

iii. 10.....ii. 202
iii. 13.....ii. 203†
iii. 16.....ii. 213†
iv. 6.....ii. 203
iv. 7.....ii. 204
iv. 23.....ii. 206
iv. 25.....ii. 206
v. 1.....ii. 207
v. 21.....ii. 208
vi. 2.....ii. 209
vi. 15.....ii. 209

EPHESIANS.

i. 1.....ii. 211*
i. 14.....ii. 213

EPHESIANS.

i. 15.....ii. 214
i. 16.....ii. 230†
ii. 13.....ii. 213†
v. 2.....ii. 215
v. 14.....ii. 231 n.
v. 30.....ii. 215
vi. 17.....ii. 213†

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 1.....ii. 218
iii. 11.....ii. 232†
iii. 13.....ii. 219
iv. 23.....ii. 220

COLOSSIANS.

i. 7.....ii. 221
i. 12.....ii. 222*
i. 18.....ii. 231 n.
i. 21.....ii. 222*
i. 27.....ii. 223
ii. 7.....ii. 224
ii. 12.....ii. 232†
ii. 18.....ii. 225
iii. 6.....ii. 227*
iv. 15.....ii. 228

1 THESSALONIANS.

i. 2.....ii. 230
i. 10.....ii. 231
ii. 12.....ii. 232
iii. 2.....ii. 234*
iv. 8.....ii. 234
iv. 16.....ii. 231 n.
v. 4.....ii. 235*

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii. 3.....ii. 237*
ii. 13.....ii. 237*
ii. 13, 14.....ii. 233†

1 TIMOTHY.

i. 12.....ii. 239*
iii. 15, 16.....ii. 213†
iii. 16.....ii. 239
iv. 10.....ii. 241
vi. 5.....ii. 242
vi. 7.....ii. 243

2 TIMOTHY.

i. 11.....ii. 245
ii. 18.....ii. 246*
iv. 17.....ii. 247

TITUS.

iii. 1.....ii. 249

PHILEMON.

6.....ii. 251*
10.....ii. 253
25.....ii. 253*

HEBREWS.

i. 8.....ii. 254*
i. 12.....ii. 255
iii. 16.....ii. 256
iv. 2.....ii. 257
vi. 2.....ii. 259*
viii. 8.....ii. 262
x. 1.....ii. 263
x. 34.....ii. 265
xii. 3.....ii. 266
xii. 7.....ii. 267
xii. 18.....ii. 268
xiii. 21.....ii. 270

JAMES.

i. 12.....ii. 272
i. 17.....ii. 273†
ii. 20.....ii. 273
ii. 26.....ii. 274

JAMES.	2 JOHN.	REVELATION.
iii. 3. ii. 275	8 ii. 294	xi. 9, 10. ii. 309
iii. 5. ii. 276		xi. 18. ii. 310
v. 20. ii. 277*	JUDE.	xiii. 1. ii. 311
	22 ii. 295	xiii. 7. ii. 313*
I PETER.		xiii. 8. ii. 313
iii. 21. ii. 278	REVELATION.	xiii. 10. ii. 314
iv. 1. ii. 279	i. 5. ii. 298*	xiii. 14. ii. 303†
iv. 1. ii. 280*	i. 15. ii. 299	xiii. 15. ii. 316
iv. 14. ii. 280	ii. 1. ii. 299	xiv. 13. ii. 317
v. 2. ii. 282	ii. 13. ii. 300	xv. 3. ii. 318
	ii. 17. ii. 301	xv. 6. ii. 319
I JOHN.	iii. 2. ii. 301	xvii. 3. ii. 321
i. 4. ii. 283	iv. 1, 7, 8. ii. 302	xviii. 3. ii. 322
iii. 5. ii. 285	v. 6. ii. 302	xviii. 7. ii. 323
iii. 14. ii. 286	v. 9. ii. 303	xviii. 19. ii. 324
iv. 20. ii. 287	vi. 1. ii. 304	xix. 13. ii. 324
v. 7. ii. 288	vi. 17. ii. 305	xx. 6. ii. 325*
v. 10. ii. 290†	xi. 5. ii. 306	xx. 9. ii. 325
v. 18. ii. 289	xi. 8, 9. ii. 307	xxi. 3. ii. 327*
		xxii. 16. ii. 327

